KWOC
Telecommunications

Public Utilities Board, Alberta

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REPORT NO. E80111

SEPTEMBER 1, 1980

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD, ALBERTA

ANWAR JAH
PRESIDING MEMBER

GEORGE CHELMICK
MEMBER

J. C. SAKS
MEMBER

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD
FOR THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

REPORT NO.: E80111 FILE NO.: E3.3.3-2

MONDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF SEPTEMBER, A.D. 1980

IN THE MATTER OF "The Public Utilities Board Act", being Chapter 302 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta, 1970, as amended;

AND IN THE MATTER OF Orders in Council 1287/78 dated December 6, 1978 and 180/79 dated February 27, 1979;

AND IN THE MATTER OF an Inquiry into the provision of all local non-broadcasting telecommunications services, including, audio, video, and data services in Alberta, referred to as the "TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY".

BEFORE:

THE PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD FOR THE PROVINCE OF ALBERTA

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Board expresses its thanks to all parties who provided information and assistance towards the development and production of this Telecommunications Inquiry Report. The Board especially, acknowledges the assistance and co-operation of the Participants in this Inquiry. The Board has, of necessity, summarized and distilled the voluminous submissions, answers to information requests, transcripts, exhibits, written summations, replies and other reference material in order to develop the recommendations in this Report. Appendix 1 of this Report lists the Telecommunications Inquiry Reference Material which the Board considered in its deliberations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
TITLE PAGE	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	2
TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES	10
ABBREVIATIONS	17
1. AUTHORIZATION	19
2. BACKGROUND	21
3. INTRODUCTION	24
(a) Notice	24
(b) Information Bulletins	24
(c) Submission Guidelines	25
(d) Pre-Hearing Conferences	26
(e) Submissions	28
(f) Public Hearings	29
(g) Written Summations/Replies	29
(h) Definitions	29
Local	30
Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications	30
(i) Scope	31
(j) Contents of the Report	32

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
4.	SUMMARY	
	(a) General	34
	(b) Categorization of Services	35
	(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services	35
	(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services	37
	(e) Provision of Transmission Facilities	40
	(f) Provision of Distribution Facilities	41
	(g) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection	42
	(h) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection	43
	(i) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization	43
	(j) Lease and Resale of Services	43
5.	THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT	44
	(a) General	44
	(b) The Telephone Systems	45
	(c) The CNCP Telecommunications System	46
	(d) The Cable Television Systems	47
	(e) The Radio Common Carriers Systems	48
	(f) Other Systems	48
6.	THE SERVICES	49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
7.	THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	51
	(a) General	51
	(b) AGT	52
	(c) 'et'	54
	(d) The Cable Television Companies	56
	(e) CNCP	58
	(f) Radio Common Carriers	59
	(g) Providers of Only Origination/ Termination Equipment	60
8.	THE ISSUES	61
	(a) General	61
	(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1)	61
	Participants' Positions	61
	Board's Position	66
	(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2)	68
	Participants' Positions	68
	Board's Position	75

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
8.	THE ISSUES (Continued)	
(d)	Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3)	78
	Participants' Positions	78
	Board's Position	83
(e)	Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4 and #5)	84
	Participants' Positions	84
	Board's Position	91
(f)	Type of Regulation (Issue #6)	92
	Participants' Positions	92
	Board's Position	101
(g)	Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7)	103
	Participants' Positions	103
	Board's Position	112
(h)	Data Processing (Issue #8)	113
	Participants' Positions	113
	Board's Position	116

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
8.	THE ISSUES (Continued)	
(i)	Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9)	117
	Participants' Positions	117
	Board's Position	122
(j)	Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10)	124
	Participants' Positions	124
	Board's Position	130
(k)	Leasing/Resale (Issue #11)	131
	Participants' Positions	131
	Board's Position	134
(l)	Tariffs Publication (Issue #12)	135
	Participants' Positions	135
	Board's Position	138
(m)	Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13)	139
	Participants' Positions	139
	Board's Position	144
(n)	Obligation to Serve	146
	Participants' Positions	146
	Board's Position	148
(o)	Pay Television	149
	Participants' Positions	149
	Board's Position	152

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
8.	THE ISSUES (Continued)	
	(p) Consistent Regulation	153
	Participants' Positions	153
	Board's Position	154
	(q) Satellite Receiving Antennae	156
	General	156
	Board's Position	156
9.	RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	157
	(a) General	157
	(b) Categorization of Services	158
	(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services	159
	(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services	164
	(e) Recommended Amendments to The AGT Act	166
	(f) Recommended Amendments to The PUB Act	167
	(g) Recommended Amendments to The MG Act	167
	(h) Recommended Amendments to The MT Act	167

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		PAGE
APPENDICES		
1	TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY REFERENCE MATERIAL	170
2	MAJOR FACILITIES USED TO PROVIDE LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	176
3	LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, SUBJECTS OF INQUIRY	177
4	LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES, EXCLUDED SUBJECTS	179
5	PHYSICAL PLANT USED TO PROVIDE BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES	180
6	PHYSICAL PLANT USED TO PROVIDE NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	181
7	CABLE TELEVISION COMPANIES IN ALBERTA	182
8	PHYSICAL PLANT USED TO PROVIDE BASIC CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES	183
9	BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES	184
10	BASIC CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES	185
11	NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	186
12	EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	188
13	RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	190
14	NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES PROVIDERS, PLANT, EXISTING AND RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	191

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES

PARTICIPANTS

1.	Alberta Government Telephones	COUNSEL:	J. D. Rooke, Esq.
			S. N. Douglas, Esq.
		WITNESS:	J. C. D. Mallet-Paret, Esq. Vice-President, Corporate Planning and Development Alberta Government Telephones
2.	Consumers' Association of Canada (Alberta)		Ms. P. Brock Chairman, Regulated Industries Committee Consumers' Association of Canada (Alberta)
3.	Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers Association	COUNSEL:	G. E. Kaiser, Esq.
			L. J. E. Dunbar, Esq.
		WITNESSES:	F. E. Paine, Esq. Director Marketing Development Honeywell Information Systems
			G. G. Murray, Esq. General Counsel International Business Machines, Canada Ltd.
			K. C. Lees, Esq. Telecommunications Adviser International Business Machines, Canada Ltd.

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

4.	Canadian Cable Television Association	:	COUNSEL:	R. J. Buchan, Esq.
			WITNESSES:	M. Hind-Smith, Esq. President and Chief Executive Officer Canadian Cable Television Association
				K. E. Hancock, Esq. Vice-President Telecommunications Phillip A. Lapp Limited
5.	CNCP Telecommunications	:	COUNSEL:	D. W. Flicker, Esq.
			WITNESSES:	C. E. Beigie, Esq. President C. D. Howe Institute
				G. Woodin, Esq. General Sales Manager Western Division CNCP Telecommunications

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

6.	Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association	:	COUNSEL:	G. E. Kaiser, Esq.
				L. J. E. Dunbar, Esq.
			WITNESSES:	K. Sebryk, Esq. Manager E.S.P. Electronic Devices Ltd.
				W. J. Till, Esq. President Till Communications Ltd.
				T. Ryan, Esq. President TAS Communication Systems Ltd.
				C. J. Gawlicki, Esq. President Millman's Communications Services Ltd.
				S. Fuson, Esq. Fire Chief Town of Drayton Valley
				E. Vetsch, Esq. President Systel Electronics Ltd.

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

7.	Cable Television Association of Alberta	:	COUNSEL:	J. W. Beames, Esq., Q.C.
			WITNESSES:	R. J. McIntyre, Esq. President Cable Television Association of Alberta Vice-President Capital Cable TV Ltd.
				J. W. Halina, Esq. Executive Director Cable Telecommunications Research Institute
				T. H. Blanks, Esq. Vice-President, Marketing TOCOM Canada Ltd.
8.	Edmonton Journal/ Calgary Herald	:	COUNSEL:	A. H. Lefever, Esq.
			WITNESS:	L. Elliott, Esq. Special Projects Coordinator Edmonton Journal

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

9.	City of Edmonton/ 'edmonton telephones'	COUNSEL:	W. Mis, Esq.
		WITNESSES:	J. B. Cleveley, Esq. Manager Intercompany Relations 'edmonton telephones'
			R. J. Mills, Esq. Manager Fibre Distribution Project Bell Northern Research
			J. R. Lumsden, Esq. Director of Product Development Control Devices
10.	Motorola Electronic Sales Limited	COUNSEL:	G. E. Kaiser, Esq.
			L. J. E. Dunbar, Esq.
		WITNESSES:	M. R. Downey, Esq. Vice-President Western Area Motorola Electronic Sales Limited
			D. Richards, Esq. Area Sales Manager Motorola Electronic Sales Limited
			R. R. Krewusik, Esq. Fire Chief Town of Grande Cache
			B. Ellert, Esq. Telecommunications Analyst Amoco Canada Petroleum Company Ltd.
			D. L. Saunders, Esq. City Manager City of Camrose

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

11.	SP Communications :	COUNSEL:	G. E. Kaiser, Esq.
			L. J. E. Dunbar, Esq.
		WITNESSES:	R. R. Hollis, Esq. Vice-President, Marketing Southern Pacific Communications Company
			J. L. Holm, Esq. Manager, Product Development and Marketing Analysis Southern Pacific Communications Company
			F. Allen, Esq. President Amoco Canada Petroleum Company Ltd.
12.	TAS Communications :	COUNSEL:	G. E. Kaiser, Esq.
			L. J. E. Dunbar, Esq.
		WITNESSES:	K. Hanson, Esq. Vice-President Western Area TAS Communications
			G. Izzard, Esq. Vice-President Radio Operations TAS Communications
			P. Assoignon, Esq. President Gencom Communications Limite

APPEARANCES AND WITNESSES (Continued)

PARTICIPANTS (Continued)

13.	Department of Utilities and Telephones	:	COUNSEL: Ms. L. Martin

ABBREVIATIONS

The Board:	The Public Utilities Board, Alberta
The Participants:	
ACSS	Association of Calgary Security Systems
AGT	Alberta Government Telephones
AMTRAK	AMTRAK Communications Ltd.
BIS	Business Intervenors Society of Alberta
CAC	Consumers' Association of Canada (Alberta)
CAL	City of Calgary
CANTELLE	Cantelle-Connect Ltd.
CARDINAL	Cardinal Communications Ltd.
CBEMA	Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers Association
CCTA	Canadian Cable Television Association
CNCP	CNCP Telecommunications
CRCCA	Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association
CTAA	Cable Television Association of Alberta
EJCH	Edmonton Journal/Calgary Herald
'et'	'edmonton telephones'
Green, Michaels	Green, Michaels & Associates Ltd.
MOTOROLA	Motorola Electronics Sales Ltd.

ABBREVIATIONS (Continued)

The Participants (Continued)

SP	Southern Pacific Communications Company
TAS	TAS Communications
TOCOM	TOCOM Canada Limited
U & T	Department of Utilities and Telephones

Other

AGT Act	Alberta Government Telephones Act
CRTC	Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission
DOC	Department of Communications
Inquiry	Telecommunications Inquiry
MG Act	Municipal Government Act
MT Act	Municipal Telephone Act
PUB Act	Public Utilities Board Act
RSA	Revised Statutes of Alberta
RSC	Revised Statutes of Canada

1. AUTHORIZATION

Section 38 of The PUB Act states as follows:

> "(1) The Board of its own motion may, and upon the request of the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall, inquire into, hear and determine any matter or thing within its jurisdiction.
>
> (2) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by order, at any time refer to the Board for a report or other action any question, matter or thing arising or required to be done in respect of any matter subject to the jurisdiction of the Board under any general or special Act and the Board shall without unnecessary delay comply with the order."

On December 6, 1978, the Lieutenant Governor in Council of Alberta issued Order in Council 1287/78 requesting the Board to

> "inquire into the provision of all local non-broadcasting telecommunications services, including audio, video and data services in Alberta, in order to ascertain the status of the providers of these services in relation to The Public Utilities Board Act and other Alberta statutes"

and to

> "make recommendations respecting the regulatory framework in which these services may be offered."

On February 27, 1979, Order in Council 180/79 further provided that the Board

> "shall determine the specific services and other matters to be included within the scope of the Inquiry".

1. AUTHORIZATION (Continued)

A division of the Board consisting of Anwar Jah, Presiding Member, George Chelmick and J. C. Saks, both Members, was assigned to conduct the Inquiry and to prepare the Report for the approval of the Board.

2. BACKGROUND

The following quote from the Board's June 8, 1979 Information Bulletin aptly describes the reasons and the necessity for the Inquiry:

> "Important developments have occurred in the telecommunications industry in the past decade and further important developments are expected in the future. It is uncertain what impact these developments will have on the provision of all types of telecommunications services in Alberta. The Alberta Government has requested the Alberta Public Utilities Board (the Board) to conduct an Inquiry into the provision of one category of telecommunications services in Alberta, that is, the local non-broadcasting telecommunications services. This Telecommunications Inquiry is intended to provide the Government with the assistance of the Board in reducing the uncertainty which currently prevails in respect to these telecommunications services."

The Board's June 8, 1979 Information Bulletin also drew attention to recent developments which could create future regulatory problems:

> "The Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) issued a Public Announcement dated June 6, 1978 inviting cable television companies to apply for permission from the CRTC to provide communication services of a non-programming nature within the local areas already served by such companies."
>
> "A public hearing was held to consider applications received from Ottawa Cablevision Limited, Grande River Cable TV and London Cable TV, all companies which serve specified areas within Ontario. These companies applied for permission to provide such non-programming telecommunications services as:

2. BACKGROUND (Continued)

(1) alarm systems (burglar/intrusion, fire and medical);
(2) business and professional services (company reports, stock trading data and other selective information of interest to business and professional communities); and
(3) diversified consumer services (news, airport schedules, and other information of interest in the home)."

"The CRTC issued its decision on March 26, 1979..."

"In reaching its decision, the CRTC considered that it has jurisdiction to approve applications by cable television companies for the provision of non-programming services because such services use channel capacity which may have adverse effects on the achievement of all the other objectives of the Broadcasting Act. In particular, the CRTC stated that its 'concern is to ensure that the priority claims of ... programming services ... are not compromised' and further that subscribers of programming services 'are not obliged to take or pay extra for non-programming services'."

"The CRTC decision has contributed to the uncertainty which prevails in the regulation of local non-broadcasting telecommunications services. Although the CRTC decided that it has jurisdiction to authorize the provision of such services, it is to be noted that Alberta legislation also authorizes the provision of and the regulation of such telecommunications services."

The Board considers that the Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services referred to in Order in Council 1287/78 include, but are not limited to, the non-programming services referred to by the CRTC. Against this background the Board launched an extensive public inquiry called the Telecommunications Inquiry.

2. BACKGROUND (Continued)

Thirteen parties actively participated in the Inquiry and, in addition to their initial statements, they produced some 400 pages of Submissions and 175 pages of Responses to Information Requests. The Board held two days of pre-hearing conferences and 15 days of hearings which generated verbatim transcripts totalling some 1,763 pages, 47 exhibits comprising some 1,153 pages and written summations and replies amounting to some 473 pages.

While the Order in Council referred to Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services in Alberta, interests represented were much more widespread. Some Participants were exclusively Albertan, others represented Canadian and foreign organizations, and several were represented by Counsel from outside Alberta. Witnesses came from Alberta, Eastern Canada and the United States.

3. INTRODUCTION

(a) Notice

The Board published Notice of the Inquiry in the nine Alberta daily newspapers on June 19 and July 6, 1979. The Notice set out the purpose of the Inquiry and included details for registration, the time and place of the Pre-Hearing Conference and made reference to the Board's Information Bulletin.

(b) Information Bulletins

The Board's Information Bulletin dated June 8, 1979 provided additional details not included in the Notice including the background information which led to the Inquiry, an identification of the existing or potential local non-broadcasting telecommunications services, the companies providing those services in Alberta and procedural matters. The Board subsequently issued Information Bulletins Nos. 2 and 3 which will be discussed under paragraph 3(d) of this Report.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(c) Submission Guidelines

The Board issued Submission Guidelines on August 1, 1979 to all parties who had previously expressed interest in the Inquiry, in order to assist Participants in the preparation of their formal submission.

A list of Participants together with their respective registration information was appended to the Guidelines.

The Guidelines addressed such topics as the background of the Participant, the nature of his interest, present services, potential services, other topics, glossaries of unfamiliar terms and an enumeration of possible issues to be considered as they appeared to the Board. It was made clear to all Participants that they should not restrict themselves to those issues, nor should they feel compelled to deal with all of them.

The Submission Guidelines were prepared after considering the registration information and recommendations respecting "Proposed Subjects of Inquiry" and "Relevant Issues" as requested in the Board's Information Bulletin dated June 8, 1979. The "Subjects of Inquiry" and "Excluded

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(c) Submission Guidelines (Continued)

Subjects", as amended and as included in the Submission Guidelines were considered by the Board to form a suitable basis upon which to commence the Inquiry.

(d) Pre-Hearing Conferences

A Pre-Hearing Conference was held on August 9, 1979 at the Law Courts, Edmonton, Alberta to define the issues, to identify the Participants and the extent of their participation, to determine the schedule for public hearings, to determine procedures and to establish dates by which subsequent stages of the Inquiry were to be accomplished.

During the Pre-Hearing Conference, the Participants raised a number of questions, including the question of the Board's jurisdiction. Some Participants considered a response was required from the Board in respect to jurisdiction before proceeding further with the Inquiry. The Board indicated that it would respond in writing to these questions and would set a date for a further Pre-Hearing Conference.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(d) Pre-Hearing Conferences (Continued)

The Board issued Information Bulletin No. 2 on September 9, 1979, and dealt with those questions raised in the first Pre-Hearing Conference which the Board considered required a response. The Board affirmed that it had jurisdiction and that it intended to proceed to conduct the Inquiry as requested by the Order in Council. The Board also pro- provided some clarifications and definitions with respect to other questions which were raised. A second Pre-Hearing Conference was set for October 17, 1979 in the Court House, Calgary, Alberta.

The second Pre-Hearing Conference was held as scheduled and dealt with administrative and procedural matters. Additional participants were allowed to register at that time, resulting in the 21 registered Participants as shown commencing on page 17 of this Report. The Board issued Information Bulletin No. 3 on December 21, 1979, which gave further directions with respect to administrative and procedural matters.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(e) Submissions

The Board received written submissions from eleven registered Participants. Several Participants stated that they would not be filing written submissions but indicated a desire to participate at a later stage of the Inquiry. Generally speaking, each submission addressed such topics as, the background of the Participant, the nature of his interest, present services, potential services, and comments and positions with respect to the issues.

Subsequent to the filing of all submissions, the Participants were given the opportunity to request any clarification regarding the material contained in the submissions of others by means of written Information Requests.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(f) Public Hearings

Public Hearings were held in Calgary, Alberta commencing April 14, 1980 and concluding on May 2, 1980. Thirteen Participants took part in the Public Hearings. Green, Michaels withdrew from the Inquiry by letter dated November 23, 1979 and BIS also withdrew by telegram dated May 1, 1980. The remainder of the 21 registered Participants either did not appear or combined their participation with other Participants.

(g) Written Summations/Replies

Eleven Participants filed Written Summations by May 26, 1980 and seven of those filed Replies to Written Summations by June 23, 1980.

(h) Definitions

The Board's terms of reference for the Inquiry refers to "Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services". Accordingly the following definitions were utilized in the Board's determination of the scope of the Inquiry.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(h) Definitions (Continued)

Local

The Province of Alberta has legislative authority over matters "Generally ... of a merely local or private nature in the Province" including "Local Works and Undertakings" other than railways, telegraphs and inter-provincial or extra-provincial undertakings (BNA Act, s.92).

Consequently the word "Local" in the context of the Inquiry was taken to mean services provided within the Province of Alberta.

Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications

The Federal Broadcasting Act, R.S.C. 1970, Chapter B-11, defines "broadcasting" as follows:

> "... any radiocommunication in which the transmissions are intended for direct reception by the general public;"

wherein "radiocommunication" means:

> "... any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writing, images, sounds or intelligence of any nature by means of electromagnetic waves of frequencies lower than 3,000 Gigacycles per second propagated in space without artifical guide".

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(h) Definitions (Continued)

Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications (Continued)

"Telecommunications" is defined similarly but more broadly in the PUB Act and the AGT Act as:

> "... any transmission, emission or reception of signs, signals, writings, images, sounds or intelligence of any nature by wire, radio, visual or other electromagnetic system."

"Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications" in the context of the Inquiry was taken to mean telecommunications that cannot be received off-air by the general public.

(i) Scope

The Board determined the scope of the Inquiry pursuant to Order in Council 180/79 considering the views of the Participants, while attempting to keep the Inquiry manageable and attempting to focus on the more significant problem areas in the provision of Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services. The Board listed the major physical plant used to provide Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services (Appendix 2) and made a final determination respecting the scope of the Inquiry in respect to Subjects of Inquiry (Appendix 3) and Excluded Subjects (Appendix 4).

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(j) Contents of the Report

The remainder of this Report contains six Sections numbered 4 to 9 inclusive.

Section 4 provides a Summary of what the Board perceives to be the most significant conclusions and recommendations contained in the Report.

Section 5 identifies the Systems of the providers of Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services within Alberta and describes the nature and extent of their physical plant.

Section 6 discusses the categorization of services into Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

Section 7 discusses the existing regulatory framework under which each of the providers currently operates.

3. INTRODUCTION (Continued)

(j) Contents of the Report (Continued)

Section 8 discusses the thirteen issues included in the Submission Guidelines with the "Participants' Positions" and the "Board's Position" provided for each. Also included is a discussion of three additional issues, the "Obligation to Serve", "Pay Television" and "Consistent Regulation" which arose during the hearings. A further issue of "Satellite Receiving Antennae" was also dealt with although it was not discussed at the Hearings.

Section 9 presents the Board's recommendations regarding the recommended regulatory framework for the provision of Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services within Alberta.

4. SUMMARY

(a) General

(1) The Board considers that the complex issues arising out of the provision of telecommunications physical plant and Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services in the Province of Alberta can be resolved through the judicious application of appropriate regulatory principles including deregulation where circumstances warrant it. (Page 157)

(2) The Board recommends that all providers of telecommunications physical plant and Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta be subject to the same regulatory framework in order to provide a consistent approach to telecommunications regulation and to ensure that equitable regulatory principles are employed. (Page 157)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(b) Categorization of Services

(1) The Board considers that all Telecommunications Services should be divided into two categories - Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. The Board recommends that it be given the authority to determine the division between Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. Recognizing that, in the future, it may be appropriate to move some Telecommunications Services from one category to the other, the Board would hold public hearings to determine if such changes in categorization were warranted. (Page 158)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services

(1) The Board recommends that all Telecommunications Services categorized as Basic Telecommunications Services be fully regulated by the Board. All parties providing or wishing to provide Basic Telecommunications Services should come under the Board's jurisdiction. (Page 159)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(2) The Board recommends that it be given the authority to regulate 'et', the Cable Television Companies and any other company or person which is involved in the provision of Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 162)

(3) The authority given to the Board should include the control of market entry. Decisions on whether or not to allow additional companies to provide any Basic Telecommunications Services would be made following public hearings. (Page 162)

(4) The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity for the extension or reinforcement of any transmission or distribution network required for the purposes of providing Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 163)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(5) The Board recommends that it should regulate only the "carriage" function of the Basic Telecommunications Services and that the regulation of "content" if and where considered necessary should be performed by other appropriate bodies. (Page 163)

(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services

(1) The Board recommends that all of the Subjects of Inquiry with the exception of Basic Television Services (B.2(a) Cable Television Systems, B.2(b) Community Antenna Television Systems) should be considered Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 164)

(2) The Board recommends that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services be regarded as competitive service offerings. Accordingly, the Board recommends that there be no market entry regulation respecting providers of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 164)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(3) The Board recommends that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services not be price regulated by the Board as long as the marketplace provides appropriate price regulation. (Page 164)

(4) The Board recommends that it monitor the marketplace price regulation by requiring the filing of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services rates with the Board for acknowledgement. (Page 164)

(5) The Board considers that it has the regulatory authority (pursuant to Section 70.1 of The PUB Act) to exempt providers of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services from public utility status and to declare Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to be exempt from price regulation. (Page 165)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(6) The Board considers that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services need only be regulated by the Board with respect to the construction or extension of any transmission/distribution network associated with these services. The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity in connection with these services. (Page 165)

(7) The Board recommends that providers who provide both Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services be required to file a Contribution Test for the collective total of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to ensure that Basic Telecommunications Services do not subsidize the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 165)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(e) Provision of Transmission Facilities

(1) The Board considers that it is in the public interest to have more than one provider of transmission facilities linking various communities in the Province of Alberta both now and in the future. (Page 66)

(2) The Board considers that competition among providers of transmission facilities will encourage efficiency and innovation in developing various Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 66)

(3) The Board recommends that it be given the authority to regulate market entry of any future provider of transmission facilities used to provide either Basic or Non-Basic Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta. (Page 66)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(f) Provision of Distribution Facilities

(1) The Board recommends that for the immediate future, there should be two separate telecommunications distribution networks (i.e. the telephone paired wire and cable distribution network and the cable television coaxial cable network). (Page 75)

(2) The Board is not persuaded, at this time, that the future telecommunications needs of all customers should be met by a single integrated distribution network. (Page 77)

(3) The Board considers that while it may be technically possible to transmit all telecommunications needs over a single fibre optic distribution network, at the present time such a network does not appear to be imminent or economically feasible. (Page 77)

(4) The Board considers that the anticipated benefits from competition and innovation in the near future should not be forfeited for the possible benefits of a total single integrated distribution network in the distant future. (Page 77)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(g) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection

(1) The Board generally favours interconnection arrangements that will enhance effective competition in the provision of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. (Page 122)

(2) The Board recommends that a liberal policy in respect to the interconnection of origination/termination equipment associated with Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should be adopted. (Page 122)

(3) The Board recommends that fair and reasonable terms and conditions be established by providers of Basic Telecommunications Services networks to protect the technical integrity of the Basic Telecommunications Services networks. The Board considers that competititon in the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should not be restricted by unreasonable terms and conditions imposed by providers of Basic Telecommunications Services networks in respect to interconnection of origination/ termination equipment. (Page 122)

(4) The Board recommends that where parties cannot mutually agree to acceptable terms and conditions that the Board be given the regulatory authority to adjudicate such disputes. (Page 123)

4. SUMMARY (Continued)

(h) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection

(1) The Board considers that interconnection of Transmission/Distribution Systems should be allowed in those cases where it is necessary to ensure effective competition in the provision of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services (Page 130)

(i) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization

(1) The Board is not persuaded, at this time, that providers of Basic Telecommunications Services who also provide or wish to provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should provide those services through an arms-length subsidiary. The Board considers that appropriate regulation will ensure that any benefits from providing Non-Basic Telecommunications Services will flow through to the Basic Telecommunications Services customer. (Page 144)

(j) Lease and Resale of Services

(1) The Board recommends that the sale for resale of any of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should be permitted as it would further enhance competition in the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services area. (Page 134)

5. THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT

(a) General

Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta may be provided by one or more of the following five systems:

(a) The Telephone Systems

(b) The Cable Television Systems

(c) The CNCP Telecommunications System

(d) The Radio Common Carrier Systems

(e) Other Systems.

The types of physical plant used to make up each of the above systems may be considered as follows:

(a) Equipment (Origination, Termination)

(b) Facilities (Transmission, Distribution, Switching)

(c) Structures (Poles, Ducts, Towers, Buildings)

This Section of this Report briefly describes the Systems and the nature and extent of the physical plant making up each of the Systems listed above.

5. THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT (Continued)

(b) The Telephone Systems

The most extensive systems of telecommunications within the Province of Alberta are the Telephone Systems. 'et' owns and operates the Telephone System within the municipal boundaries of the City of Edmonton. AGT owns and operates the Telephone System serving the remainder of the Province of Alberta.

Appendix 5 lists the significant items of the Telephone System physical plant used to provide Basic Telephone Services and Appendix 6 lists the significant items of the Telephone System physical plant used to provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. 'et' constructs its physical plant along public rights of way within the municipal boundaries of the City of Edmonton pursuant to Section 285 of the MG Act. AGT constructs its physical plant along public rights of way within the Province of Alberta pursuant to Section 26 of the AGT Act.

5. THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT (Continued)

(c) The CNCP Telecommunications System

The earliest telecommunications system within the Province of Alberta was the CNCP System originally used for telegraph. CNCP owns and operates the CNCP Telecommunications System within the Province of Alberta.

Currently CNCP provides only Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. Appendix 6 lists the significant items of physical plant used to provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. CNCP constructs its physical plant along railway rights of way within the Province of Alberta pursuant to Section 312.(1) of the Federal Railway Act.

5. THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT (Continued)

(d) The Cable Television Systems

The most recent telecommunications systems within the Province of Alberta are the Cable Television Systems. Fifteen Cable Television Companies as listed in Appendix 7 own and operate the Cable Television Systems within the Province of Alberta.

Appendix 8 lists the significant items of Cable Television System physical plant used to provide Basic Cable Television Services. The Cable Television Companies construct their physical plant along the same public rights of way used by the Telephone Systems after obtaining the necessary attachment or other approval from either AGT or 'et' as applicable.

5. THE SYSTEMS AND THE PHYSICAL PLANT (Continued)

(e) The Radio Common Carriers Systems

The Radio Common Carriers Systems are relatively minor telecommunications systems within the Province of Alberta. They provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services primarily in the area of mobile radio, radio paging and telephone answering services. Radio Common Carriers own and operate their systems within the Province of Alberta

Radio Common Carriers normally construct their physical plant on their own private property.

(f) Other Systems

Other minor telecommunications systems exist within the Province of Alberta, primarily constructed for private company or private individual use. Included in this category of "Other Systems" are origination/termination telecommunications equipment owned by private companies/persons and used in conjunction with Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. Private companies/persons own and operate their "Other Systems" within the Province of Alberta.

Private companies/persons normally construct their physical plant on their own private property.

6. THE SERVICES

The Board considers that the Telecommunications Services provided by the Telephone Systems and the Cable Television Systems should be categorized into Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

Basic Telecommunications Services are defined as those services which generally have monopolistic attributes and/or which are generally considered to be essential public services.

Non-Basic Telecommunications Services are defined as those services which generally have competitive attributes and which are not generally considered to be essential public services.

The Board previously addressed the categorization of AGT's Telecommunications Services into Basic and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services during the Manner of Regulation Hearing. Decision E76090 issued July 8, 1976 established an initial categorization and the Board indicated that it expected this categorization to be further refined over time.

6. THE SERVICES (Continued)

The Board considers that the concept of Basic and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should be further defined for the Telephone Systems and should be applied to the Cable Television Systems as follows:

(a)	Basic Telephone Services	Appendix 9
(b)	Basic Cable Television Services	Appendix 10
(c)	Non-Basic Telecommunications Services	Appendix 11

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

(a) General

The Lieutenant Governor in Council of Alberta issued Order in Council 1287/78 on December 6, 1979 requesting the Board to

> "inquire into the provision of all local non-broadcasting telecommunications services, including audio, video and data services in Alberta, in order to ascertain the status of the providers of these services in relation to the Public Utilities Board Act and other Alberta statutes"
> (Emphasis added)

Accordingly this Section of this Report deals with the status of providers of Telecommunications Services in Alberta with respect to the existing regulatory framework.

The Board considers that a regulatory framework should deal with the regulation of such matters as:

(1) Price (rate base, rate of return, revenue requirement, rates)
(2) Franchise Approval
(3) Systems Interconnection
(4) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection
(5) Quality of Service
(6) Safety
(7) System of Accounts
(8) Rules and Regulations
(9) Financing Approval
(10) Construction and Operating Approval
(11) Siting and Right-of-Way Approval
(12) Attachments (Poles, Ducts, Trenching)
(13) Frequency/Bandwidth Allocation
(14) Program Content
(15) Technical Standards

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(a) General (Continued)

The Board is not currently involved in regulating the "content" aspect of Telecommunications Services.

(b) AGT

AGT is regulated by the Board which derives its jurisdiction and authority in respect to the regulation of AGT primarily from two Alberta statutes.

(1) The Public Utilities Board Act, RSA 1970, Ch. 302, as amended.

(2) The Alberta Government Telephones Act, RSA 1970, Ch. 12, as amended.

Decision E76090 classified AGT's services as Basic Service Offerings and Non-Basic Service Offerings. The Basic Service Offerings are regulated by the Board respecting individual prices (i.e. rates, tolls, fares or charges) charged for each service. The Non-Basic Service Offerings are not regulated by the Board respecting the individual prices charged for each service. However Non-Basic Telecommunications Services are monitored to ensure that the collective total of the Non-Basic Service Offerings makes a positive contribution towards the prices charged to the telephone customers for the Basic Service Offerings.

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(b) AGT (Continued)

The following is a list of the Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services provided by AGT categorized and identified in accordance with Appendix 3.

B.1 COMMON CARRIER CARRIAGE SERVICES

(a) Voice Private Line Signal Carriage
(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(c) Television Signal Carriage
(d) Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage
(e) Paging Signal Carriage
(f) Music Signal Carriage

B.2 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

(d) Closed Circuit Television Systems

B.3 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

(a) Public Mobile Telephone Systems (Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
(b) Private Mobile Telephone Systems
(d) Mobile Paging Systems

B.4 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

(g) Telemetering Systems
(h) Telephone Answering-Recording Systems
(i) Automatic Dialling Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/Controlling Services)

These services are considered Non-Basic Telecommunications Services by the Board and are therefore not regulated as to price.

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(b) AGT (Continued)

AGT is also regulated with respect to frequency allocation by the DOC pursuant to the Radio Act, RSC 1970, Ch. R-1, and with respect to safety by the Alberta Department of Labour.

Appendix 12 lists the regulatory functions provided by the Board and other regulatory bodies with respect to AGT under the existing regulatory framework.

(c) 'et'

The PUB Act specifically excludes from the Board's full jurisdiction any system owned by a municipality that has not voluntarily come under the Board by passing a by-law pursuant to Section 102 of The PUB Act. Since the City of Edmonton has not passed such a by-law, 'et' has not come under the operation of The PUB Act, and is not subject to the control and orders of the Board.

It should be noted, however, that Section 90 of The PUB Act provides as follows:

> "Every municipality operating a public utility shall keep the accounts thereof in the manner prescribed by the Board for the accounting by the owners of similar public utilities, and shall file with the Board such statements thereof as may be directed by the Board."

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) 'et' (Continued)

It should also be noted that Section 280 of The MG Act, RSA 1970, Ch. 246, as amended, provides as follows:

> "Any user of a public utility being aggrieved respecting service charges, rates and tolls made to such user may by application appeal to the Public Utilities Board and the Board, if satisfied that such service charge
>
> (a) does not conform to the public utility rate structure established by the municipality, or
>
> (b) has been improperly imposed, or
>
> (c) is discriminatory,
>
> may make an order varying, adjusting or disallowing the whole or any part of such charge."

The Board, therefore, has only limited authority over 'et' as described above.

No other 'et' functions are formally regulated by the Board. Rates, quality of service and safety are established by the owner of the utility (i.e. the City of Edmonton) subject to applicable statutes and regulations. (See Appendix 12)

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) 'et' (Continued)

The following is a list of the Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services provided by 'et' categorized and identified in accordance with Appendix 3:

B.1 COMMON CARRIER CARRIAGE SERVICES

(a) Voice Private Line Signal Carriage
(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(d) Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage
(e) Paging Signal Carriage
(f) Music Signal Carriage

B.3 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

(b) Private Mobile Telephone Systems
(d) Mobile Paging Systems

B.4 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

(g) Telemetering Systems
(h) Telephone Answering-Recording Systems
(i) Automatic Dialling Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/Controlling Services)

(d) The Cable Television Companies

The Cable Television Companies are licensed by the CRTC pursuant to the Broadcasting Act, RSC 1970, Ch. B-11. The CRTC also regulates quality of service (including program content) and the maximum rates to be charged for installation services and monthly cable television service. The Cable Television Companies are also subject

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(d) The Cable Television Companies (Continued)

to certain technical certification requirements by the DOC pursuant to the Radio Act, RSC 1970.

The following is a list of the Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services provided by the Cable Television Companies within Alberta categorized and identified in accordance with Appendix 3:

B.1 COMMON CARRIER CARRIAGE SERVICES

(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(c) Television Signal Carriage

B.2 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

(a) Cable Television Systems
(b) Community Antenna Television Systems

B.5 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

(a) News and Weather Systems

The Cable Television Companies have the capability to offer many of the other Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services shown in Appendix 3. The Board is aware that one Alberta Cable Television Company has made application to the CRTC to offer such services.

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(d) The Cable Television Companies (Continued)

In Decision 79-266 in respect to applications by three Ontario Cable Television Companies, the CRTC stated that it considered it has the jurisdiction to regulate the "non-programming services by Cable Television licensees" described in that Decision approving such services. As noted earlier in this Report those services are considered by the Board to be "Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services".

(e) CNCP

CNCP is a federally incorporated entity regulated by the CRTC pursuant to provisions of the Railway Act, RSC 1970, Ch. R-2. The CRTC regulates the quality of service and prices charged for telecommunications services provided by CNCP within the Province of Alberta.

The following is a list of the Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services provided by CNCP categorized and identified in accordance with Appendix 3:

B.1 COMMON CARRIER CARRIAGE SERVICES

(a) Voice Private Line Signal Carriage
(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(c) Television Signal Carriage
(d) Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(f) Radio Common Carriers

The Radio Common Carriers were represented at the Inquiry by their association, the CRCCA, and by two of its members, TAS and MOTOROLA. CRCCA members are licensed by the DOC pursuant to the Radio Act, RSC 1970, Ch. R-1. Rates and quality of service are determined in the marketplace. The following is a list of the Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services provided by the CRCCA members categorized and identified in accordance with Appendix 3:

B.3 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

(a) Public Mobile Telephone Systems (Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
(b) Private Mobile Telephone Systems
(d) Mobile Paging Systems

B.4 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

(a) Fire Alarm Systems
(b) Police Alarm Systems
(c) Medical Alarm Systems
(d) Other Emergency Alarm Systems
(g) Telemetering Systems
(h) Automatic Answering-Recording Systems

7. THE EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(g) Providers of Only Origination/Termination Equipment

Numerous organizations provide customers within Alberta directly with much of the origination/termination equipment shown in Category A.1 in Appendix 6. MOTOROLA and CBEMA, the latter a non-profit trade association which represents computer and business equipment manufacturers in Canada, participated in the Inquiry. A number of CBEMA member firms and MOTOROLA manufacture and market products specifically designed to be attached to telecommunications facilities. Prices and quality of origination/termination equipment are determined in the marketplace.

8. THE ISSUES

(a) General

This Section of this Report reviews the issues discussed during the Inquiry and provides the background material and reasons for the Board's recommended regulatory framework.

Each major issue is presented, followed by the "Participants' Positions" and the "Board's Position".

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1)

Is it in the public interest to have more than one telecommunications common carrier providing transmission facilities linking various communities in the Province of Alberta both now and in the future?

Participants' Positions

All Participants who took a position respecting this issue agreed (except for 'et') that it was in the public interest to have more than one provider of transmission facilities. AGT's agreement was qualified in that it considered the number of providers of telecommunications transmission facilities should be limited to the current providers, namely AGT and CNCP.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 52, AGT Summation)

"In relation to the question of transmission facilities AGT holds the position that it would be in the public interest (Ex. #1 Pg. 7):

a. to have only one provider of transmission facilities relating to basic services; and
b. to limit the number of providers of transmission facilities for non-basic services to CNCP and AGT."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"'edmonton telephones' believes that the public interest can best be served by having one integrated network provided by the telecommunication carrier within their respective jurisdiction."

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 23, Exhibit 12)

"Yes...there is presently more than one telecommunication carrier providing transmission facilities, and there could be more in the future, in each case without any likely misallocation of resources resulting."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 12, Exhibit 10)

"The CCTA believes that continued competition among telecommunication common carriers providing long haul transmission services in Alberta, such as AGT, CNCP and Telesat, is in the public interest of consumers of such services..."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 18, Exhibit 35)

"I do not think it in the public interest of the Province of Alberta to allow competitive entry that is geared solely to providing transmission along very high density routes. This is a form of 'cream skimming' that I regard as being inappropriate in the Alberta context. Competition should be allowed, however, among firms wanting to build transmission facilities as part of a program for providing competitive services to customers in a broad range of locations in the Province."

(6) SP's Position

SP did not specifically take a position. However

SP did state on Pg. 23, Exhibit 31:

"Southern Pacific has submitted that the public interest requires that intercity telecommunication services be offered on a competitive basis."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 9, Exhibit 17)

"CBEMA believes that it is in the public interest to allow more than one telecommunication common carrier to provide transmission facilities... the reason for this position is that as users and as providers of equipment which uses the telecommunication services, we have found there are many advantages to having competition in the supply of transmission facilities."

(8) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 25)

"While we are not intimately familar with the extent to which the two existing carriers serve the needs of Albertans, we are of the opinion that there must be opportunities for competition in order that the needs of users will be responded to more quickly and that individual carriers may establish preeminence in offering services in which they excel. Marketplace forces must have an impact on services offered to the public and this will only be possible in the most effective manner through competition. The public interest will be protected through the regulatory mechanism which must be the basis for any carrier services being offered at all."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) CAC's Position (Reference Pg. 2, CAC Summation)

"CAC strongly believes it is in the public interest that there be more than one telecommunications common carrier providing transmission facilities linking various communities in Alberta and that, there should be more than one telecommunications common carrier providing distribution facilities within the province. If there is not more than one common carrier providing these facilities, the company could become complacent and not see the actual needs or wants of the public."

(10) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that it is in the public interest to have more than one provider of transmission facilities linking various communities in the Province of Alberta both now and in the future.

The Board considers that competition among providers of transmission facilities will encourage efficiency and innovation in developing various Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

At the present time there are two providers of transmission facilities (AGT and CNCP) in the Province of Alberta. The Board recommends that it be given the authority to regulate market entry of any future provider of transmission facilities used to provide either Basic or Non-Basic Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(b) Provision of Transmission Facilities (Issue #1) (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of convenience and necessity for all new extensions and reinforcements used to provide Basic and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to ensure the economic, orderly and efficient development of telecommunications transmission facilities within the Province of Alberta.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2)

Is it in the public interest to have more than one telecommunications common carrier providing distribution facilities within each community in the Province of Alberta both now and in the future?

Participants' Positions

The Participants who took a position respecting this issue were not in agreement respecting the appropriate number of providers of distribution facilities.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 7, Exhibit 1)

"We do not believe so. There are significant efficiencies and economies that can be provided by a single carrier in areas such as planning, engineering, construction, installation, maintenance and billing. Whenever fragmentation occurs, duplication becomes almost inevitable, with a resultant loss of these economies and efficiencies...The next two decades of technological advance will demand a commercially mature ultra high speed local distribution system capable of carrying two-way voice, data, video or whatever signals are required."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) AGT's Position (Continued)

and in AGT's Summation pg. 69:

"a. It is in the public interest, in the long run, to have a fully integrated network with a single owner (although various owners may amalgamate for that particular purpose);"

and

"d. The importance of this issue in terms of telecommunications in Alberta cannot be underestimated. Implementation timing is of the essence since, insofar as an integrated network is not now started, competitive systems will evolve with substantially the same resulting capabilities, including excess capacity and duplication - this will not be in the public interest. Furthermore, once such competing systems have been developed it will be difficult if not impossible to rationalize such systems."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"No- 'edmonton telephones' believes that duplication of distribution facilities would result in the loss of economies, efficiencies in areas such as planning, physical plant, installation and maintenance."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 25, Exhibit 12)

"Yes... there is presently more than one entity owning and operating telecommunications distribution networks in Alberta. The CTAA believes that the public interest has been served thereby, and it could also be served by more, and the 'technical capabilities' make it likely that local non-broadcasting telecommunications services could be provided by more than one supplier without any misallocation of resources."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Comtinued)

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 9, CCTA Summation)

"The CCTA submits that the evidence adduced at the Inquiry made it abundantly clear that it is simply too early to predict with any certitude whether the future introduction of fibre optic technology, at the local distribution level by the telephone companies, coupled with related developments in the field of micro electronics and switching, will necessarily result in economic forces that dictate a single integrated network for local distribution of telecommunication services. It was clearly established that utilization of optical fibres will not be limited to the telephone companies because cable television companies plan to utilize this new technology when it becomes an economic alternative to coaxial cable. It was further established that developments in the field of micro electronics, which will probably have the effect of moving the switching function closer to the subscriber, may well serve to allow cable television companies to provide an even broader range of services than is currently possible."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 20 & 21, Exhibit 35)

"For the time being, I see no necessary disservice to the public interest in having two largely distinct distribution networks (or even in having different corporate entities supplying public switched-network distribution facilities in Alberta's two major cities). Looking into the future, it is quite conceivable that technology will evolve in a direction that will make 'subscriber loops' (possibly based on a fiber optics distribution medium) both technically and economically attractive...Much more likely is a single integrated distribution network for supplying all types of service. This would involve, in all probability, a set of local monopolies, taking into account demonstrated economies of scale and other technical considerations."

and in Reply pg. 5:

"Moreover, to adopt the concept of the single integrated network is in a sense to commit oneself to a fixed philosophy of network architecture at a time when the technology is extremely unsettled. AGT relies upon the advent of fibre optics as support for its position, but that technology is by no means a mature one and has not been conclusively proven to be economically viable for the full range of telecommunications transmission purposes."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(6) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 11, Exhibit 17)

"CBEMA believes it is not in the public interest to restrict to one the number of telecommuncation common carriers providing distribution facilities within a community...The capabilities of the two existing technologies are very different. Thus, competition between the administrations which operate the two systems is likely to result in innovative approaches and services, as well as in least cost solutions to applications. We believe this is in the public interest."

(7) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 25)

"For the same reasons as in Issue #1 we would recommend that competition between carriers should be permitted to the extent that there is no logical and clearly demonstrable advantage to a single carrier monopoly providing the distribution service."

(8) CAC's Position (Reference Pg. 2, CAC's Summation)

"CAC strongly believes it is in the public interest that there be more than one telecommunications common carrier providing transmission facilities linking various communities in Alberta and that, there should be more than one telecommunications common carrier providing distribution facilities within the province. If there is not more than one common carrier providing these facilities, the company could become complacent and not see the actual needs or wants of the public."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board recommends that for the immediate future, there should be two separate telecommunications distribution networks (i.e. the telephone paired wire and cable distribution network and the cable television coaxial cable network). Each network provides for the basic needs of the respective telephone and cable television customers using the currently available technology in the most economic manner.

The Board considers that competition for the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services between the two existing networks is also in the public interest since the competition appears to have encouraged innovation and appears to have advanced the date by which such services may become available to the customer.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board recommends that it be given the authority to regulate market entry of any future provider of distribution facilities used to provide Basic or Non-Basic Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta.

The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of convenience and necessity for all new extensions and reinforcements used to provide Basic or Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to ensure the economic, orderly and efficient development of telecommunications distribution facilities within the Province of Alberta.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(c) Provision of Distribution Facilities (Issue #2) (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board also considers that some of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services may be more readily adaptable to and more economically provided by the telephone paired wire and cable network while other Non-Basic Telecommunications Services may be more readily adaptable to and more economically provided by the cable television network.

The Board is not persuaded, at this time, that the future telecommunications needs of all customers should be met by a single integrated distribution network. The Board considers that while it may be technically possible to transmit all telecommunications needs over a single fibre optic distribution network, at the present time such a network does not appear to be imminent or economically feasible.

The Board considers that the anticipated benefits from competition and innovation in the near future should not be forfeited for the possible benefits of a total single integrated distribution network in the distant future.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3)

Is it in the public interest to have more than one provider for each type of telecommunications orgination/termination equipment both now and in the future?

Participants' Positions

All Participants who took a position respecting this issue agreed that it was in the public interest to have more than one provider of telecommunications orgination/termination equipment.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 9, Exhibit 1)

"All of the types of origination/termination equipment listed in Appendix A[1] for use with the services listed in Appendix B[2] of the Submission Guidelines are currently supplied to end users by more than one provider. Considering the large number of variations and options available in each type of equipment it is unlikely that any one provider could satisfy market needs for any class of terminal."

---

1. refers to Appendix A of Submission Guidelines dated August 1, 1979 (Appendix 2 of this Report)

2. refers to Appendix B of Submission Guidelines dated August 1, 1979 (Appendix 3 of this Report)

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"'edmonton telephones' does not presently permit switched network addressing terminal interconnection. However, envisioned under the integrated network concept, origination/termination devices to the extent that they do not jeopardize the operational efficiency of the network or monopolize the usage unfairly should be available to users either through 'edmonton telephones' or third parties."

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 26, Exhibit 12)

"A user of facilities is generally dissatisfied when only one firm provides all of the services when that firm is unable or unwilling to adjust to rapid technological change. One of the most significant aspects of such new services is that the new technology is shifting control of the content of the transmission from the sender/vendor and placing it in the hands of the user. That new emphasis upon control by the user will likely increase his dissatisfaction with one firm control:, and the CTAA believes that the public interest would be served by having multiple carriers and origination/termination facilities so that the user has the freedom to decide upon the form of system which he wishes to use."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 14, Exhibit 10)

"The CCTA believes that, as a general rule, it is in the public interest to foster competition in the supply of origination/termination facilities for use in conjunction with telecommunication undertakings. In brief, the CCTA does not recognize any advantage to be gained by granting one manufacturer or supplier of origination/termination facilities a monopolistic position in the Alberta market."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 22, Exhibit 35)

"The opportunity to attach facilities for message origination and termination to the basic-service distribution network is an essential feature of any plan for workable competition in the provision of competitive services. Therefore, opportunities for such attachments are in the public interest because they are the most direct feature for implementing policies to promote dynamic efficiency. The second point relates to the manufacturing of terminals or indeed any other kind of telecommunication apparatus. Given Alberta's quite understandable concerns about the industrial development of the province, the temptation will be great to use its telecommunications requirements to help foster an indigenous telecommunications manufacturing industry. I would strongly urge that this specific conclusion be rejected by Alberta. With a dynamic and enlarging market, especially one characterized by rapid service innovation, Alberta should be able to attract telecommunications manufacturing without having to resort to artificial restraints on competition."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(6) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pg. 31, CRCCA Summation)

"That it is in the public interest that competition be preserved with respect to mobile communication services."

(7) TAS' Position (Reference Pg. 2, Exhibit 28)

"As a non-basic service, rates and terms relating to radio paging services offered by Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones are not regulated by the Board on the understanding that competition will provide the necessary protection for the subscriber. While TAS Communications does not object to this principle it is submitted that such competition must be fair competition."

(8) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 25)

"As we have already explained, private mobile services cannot be interconnected except under conditions favourable to the carrier which include carrier ownership of the interconnecting terminal equipment. This requirement precludes completely any competitive negotiation between the user and the various suppliers."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 18, Exhibit 17)

"In summary, CBEMA believes that the evidence shows that competition in the supply of all forms of origination/termination equipment is in the public interest and that it is not in the public interest for carriers to provide such equipment either on a monopoly basis or on a competitive basis without adequate safeguards to separate these operations from their monopoly services."

(10) Other Participant's Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(d) Provision of Origination/Termination Equipment (Issue #3) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that it is in the public interest to have more than one provider of telecommunications origination/termination equipment both now and in the future. The Board considers that competition will encourage innovation and provide customers with options and choices to best meet their particular needs.

The Board considers that providers of only origination/termination equipment need not be regulated by the Board.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4 & #5)

Which of the "Subjects of Inquiry" have monopolistic characteristics and who should be the provider?

Which of the "Subjects of Inquiry" have competitive characteristics and who should be the provider(s)?

Participants' Positions

There was general agreement among the Participants that all of the services listed under the "Subjects of Inquiry" should be competitive with the exception of cable television and community antenna television systems.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 9, Exhibit 1)

"All of the 'Subjects of Inquiry' have attributes that would support the provision of the services or at least portions of them, by more than one provider. At the same time, portions of all or most of the services have monopolistic characteristics. Until more specific knowledge is available, it would be difficult to determine who should be the providers of any of the services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4 & #5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) AGT's Position (Continued)

In its summation (Reference Pg. 72) AGT stated:

"It is submitted that what resulted from the Inquiry is that most of the services would be competitive (including, for example, Pay TV - TR1300; TR 1700 - 1701) with a number of significant exceptions:"

AGT's exceptions are Basic Telephone Services which are excluded subjects and Cable Television Systems and Community Antenna Television Systems.

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"Presently 'edmonton telephones' considers the switched network addressing devices to be a monopolistic right of the telecommunication carrier under existing Provincial legislation. Examples of these services are B.1(e) Paging Signal Carriage, B.3(a) Public Mobile Telephone Systems, B.4(e) Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/Controlling Services.)

With the exception of those services previously identified in Issue #4, all subjects of the Inquiry relating to origination/termination equipment should be competitive unless they are judged in the future to be Basic Services. (i.e. Emergency Alarm Systems.)"

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4 & #5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pgs. 27 & 28, Exhibit 12)

"The CTAA reiterates its position that subjects (a) (b) and (c) of Section B.2 of Appendix B should not be Subjects of Inquiry, but rather should be Excluded Subjects in the same manner as Basic Telephone Services."

"All of the other 'Subjects of Inquiry' have competitive characteristics, and there should be no limitations upon the number of suppliers other than market forces resulting from competition."

"Other" refers to all Subjects of Inquiry except Cable Television Systems, Community Antenna Television Systems and Pay Television Systems.

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 16, Exhibit 10)

"The CCTA believes that all of the subjects of inquiry other than those listed in Appendix B.2[1] have competitive characteristics and should be provided on a competitive basis."

Appendix B.2 lists Public or Private Television Services and includes Cable Television, Community Antenna Television, Pay Television and Closed Circuit Television Systems.

---

[1] refers to Appendix B of the Submission Guidelines dated August 1, 1979. (Appendix 3 of this Report.)

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4 &#5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 25 & 26, Exhibit 35)

"Carriage over the basic service network should be permitted to complete distribution of messages that might originate in another community and be carried over the transmission facilities of a competitive carrier. The fact that any of the mentioned messages is to be carried over the facilities of a Basic-Service supplier does not necessitate that this supplier would have a monopoly in offering the service to customers. Each message may have some form of operation performed on it, and this value-adding function can be made competitive."

"Public or Private Mobile Services are essentially add-ons, and each of the specific services listed is a candidate for workable competition."

"Public or Private Remote Monitoring and Controlling and Information Services are all candidates for competition...Competition will promote innovation in the development of these extra services, which will enhance the value, and hence the usage, of the basic system or of a system that is not now competitive with the basic-service network (the cable-television system)."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4&#5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Continued)

In Reply, (Reference Pg. 6), CNCP states:

"AGT argues for a flexible policy in the delineation between monopoly and competitive services and there is nothing inherently wrong with that. However, the proceedings have amply demonstrated that in almost all services (public switched voice is the exception) competition is to be the rule and monopoly the exception and where monopoly is sought the onus must be upon him who seeks it to prove that the overriding public good will be served. Moreover, the distinction between 'basic' and 'monopoly' services is here most important. There is no logical reason why any service which is or becomes viewed as 'basic' must of necessity be provided on a monopolistic basis. The aggrandizement of monopolies should be rigorously guarded against."

(6) SP's Position (Reference Pg. 2, Exhibit 31)

"Recent evidence in the United States, clearly indicates that the public is best served by competition in intercity communication services. Put differently, intercity telecommunications transmission does not appear to have any natural monopoly characteristics. Competition has produced a wider choice of services at lower cost without adversely affecting telephone company revenues."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4&#5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pg. 1 & 2, Exhibit 20)

"...the Association proposes to address the desirability of competition in radio paging and mobile radio. In this connection, it will be the Association's submission that the public interest will be served and competition will be improved by the authorization of facilities and transmission interconnection between licensed radio common carriers and telephone companies..."

(8) TAS' Position

While TAS does not specifically address this issue it may be inferred from the following that TAS believes public or private mobile services should be competitive (Reference Pg. 2, Exhibit 28):

"...radio paging services offered by Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones are not regulated by the Board on the understanding that competition will provide the necessary protection for the subscriber. While TAS Communications does not object to this principle it is submitted that such competition must be fair competition."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4&#5) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 25)

"We regard all of the Subjects of Inquiry under B.3 and B.4 as having competitive characteristics. Services should be provided by entrepreneurs or on a private basis using, where necessary and available, the facilities of regulated Carriers for transmission and switching."

Items B.3 and B4 refer to Mobile Services and Remote Monitoring and Controlling Services, respectively.

(10) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 19, Exhibit 17)

"Any service should be competitive unless conditions of natural monopoly can be shown to exist. We prefer, therefore, to state principles which we believe should be applied by experts to determine whether a service has monopolistic characteristics. CBEMA believes if these guidelines are applied to the 'Subjects of Inquiry' by experts in each of the subjects, that very few will be determined to have monopoly characteristics."

(11) EJCH's Position (Reference E.1. Exhibit 15)

"Generally speaking, all of the non-telecommunications services listed under Sections B.4 and B.5 of the Subjects of Inquiry have competitive characteristics."

(12) CAC's Position

CAC did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(e) Monopoly and Competitive Services (Issues #4&#5) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that it is in the public interest to have competition in the provision of the Telecommunications Services listed in Appendix 11. Accordingly, the Board recommends that these services be declared Non-Basic Services for all providers of Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta.

The Board notes that this service categorization is a natural extension to the AGT Services declared Non-Basic in the Board's Manner of Regulation Decision E76090.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6)

What type of regulation (if any) is in the public interest for each of the "Subjects of Inquiry"?

Participants' Positions

There was general agreement among the Participants, who stated a position with respect to this issue, that competition in the marketplace would perform the necessary regulatory functions. Further, where companies supplying Basic Telecommunications Services also provided Non-Basic Telecommunications Services, there should be no cross-subsidization of Non-Basic by Basic Telecommunications Services. Several Participants indicated that the competition must be fair and equitable.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 1)

"AGT believes that the services listed as 'Subjects of Inquiry' when provided by an organization also providing Basic Services should not be individually price regulated but should be subject to a Contribution Test... A means of demonstrating that Non-Basic Services are not subsidized by the Basic Services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) -(Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) AGT's Position (Continued)

AGT further stated in Summation (Reference Pg. 77)

"AGT was of the view, as expressed by Mr. Mallet-Paret in cross-examination, that if non-broadcasting telecommunications services were going to be in competition with AGT, similar services should be regulated by the same regulator to provide consistency at the minimum (TR357/2-11; Ex.#1, Pg. 10)."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference Response to 'et'/

Board Information Request No. 1)

"As outlined on pages 15 and 16 of the 'et' submission, the types of regulation envisioned under an integrated network concept for origination and termination facilities associated with the subjects of inquiry would be twofold:

1. The marketplace would become the economic regulator for supply and demand variables.

2. A mutually agreed upon third party, such as, but not necessarily, the Department of Communications, would become the technical regulator. This body would establish the minimum technical standards for terminal facilities connected to the network."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 32, Exhibit 12)

"No regulation of the kind generally administered by the Public Utilities Board is necessary to the extent that any Subject of Inquiry has, and is permitted to have, competitive characteristics,..Such competitive Subjects of Inquiry are being offered by providers of basic monopoly service, some regulation may be necessary to ensure that such provider did not unfairly eliminate competition by subsidization from basic monopoly service."

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 17, Exhibit 10)

"Since the member companies of the CCTA are not subject to the regulatory jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Board, Alberta, the CCTA does not believe it would be appropriate to comment on this issue."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pgs. 27 - 31, Exhibit 35)

"Because of my advocacy of a policy favoring the maximum practical leeway for workable competition, 'I would argue for a position that allows competition to substitute for regulation whenever possible.' Competition, whether actual or potential (meaning the existence of firms capable of entering an industry in which established firms are falling significantly short of public expectations), can perform many 'regulatory' functions, if allowed to do so."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Continued)

"Market entry regulation. In general, this type of regulation should apply to services under headings B.1, B.2 and B.3. Unlimited entry for these services would run the risk of causing wasteful duplication of facilities.

Price or non-price regulation. Competition requires that the terms on which basic service is made available do not discriminate against competitive offerings either by using basic-service revenues to subsidize competitive services or by setting terms of access to the basic service that place competitors at a disadvantage.

Siting and rights of way approval. Again, this form of regulation applies to entry conditions... should apply to any supplier of carriage service, and particularly to basic-service suppliers, including suppliers of television carriage systems.

Franchise granting. Any firm obtaining a monopoly position in a telecommunications service should be subject to a franchise-granting mechanism.

Quality and adequacy of service. With competitive services, the market will determine the public interest in this regard.

Overall return. Overall return from revenues derived on sales of monopoly services must be regulated to ensure that excess revenues do not exist for use in subsidizing competitive services.

Accounting procedures. Nationally uniform regulatory guidelines are required, over and above normal guidelines for tax purposes, to ensure that monopoly service revenues and the monopoly service pricing structure are not used unfairly to influence consumer choice regarding competitive services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Continued)

Accounting Procedures (Continued)

"The guidelines should be prepared at the national level with participation from provincial regulatory agencies. The criterion should essentially be that prices charged on competitive services should fully compensate the costs of providing those services. In effect, monopoly service revenues should not cross-subsidize competitive service offerings."

(6) SP's Position (Reference commencing Pg. 23, Exhibit 31)

"If competition is permitted to develop in a fair and non-discriminatory fashion detailed rate regulation should not be necessary... Resellers do not operate in a natural monopoly market that would warrant imposition of the full range of traditional common carrier regulations... Rates for various specialized carrier services need not be approved by the Board in detail... to ensure that the specialized common carriers have access to the network of the telephone companies at fair and reasonable terms and that such access contains the necessary protection to ensure the technical integrity of the telephone companies facilities...Access charges...this Board must determine the appropriateness of these charges in accordance with the Board's accepted regulatory principles."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pg. 27, CRCCA Summation)

"The Association supports the regulatory procedures for non-basic services currently enumerated by this Board provided that there is fair and equitable competition with respect to the non-basic service offering. As the Association has submitted in detail in this Argument, that is currently not the case with respect to mobile radio communications services. Nonetheless it remains the Association's submission that the remedy lies in the Board recommending appropriate inter-connection rights to restore competition in the marketplace rather than altering the regulatory framework."

(8) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 51, Motorola Summation)

"In summary, Motorola submits that non-price regulation is appropriate for non-basic services provided that fair and equitable competition exists in the marketplace. Such fair and equitable competition will however require the enactment of procedures to ensure the implementation of appropriate interconnection agreements between AGT and its competitors with respect to radio services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) TAS' Position (Reference Pg. 12, TAS Summation)

"The radio paging offerings of AGT have been declared by this Board to be non-basic services. As such there is no regulation as to price or any effective regulation of any nature except the filing of a tariff for the information of the Board.

TAS Communications remains of the view that this may well be the appropriate procedure by which to regulate the competitive offering such as radio paging. However, the procedure is only appropriate if competition is carried out on a fair and equitable basis."

(10) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 22, Exhibit 17)

"If a monopoly is established to be in the public interest, regulation must be substituted for the controls which would normally result from competition."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(10) CBEMA's Position (Continued)

CBEMA then provided some guidelines:

"1. Regulation must protect that resource.

2. Regulation must assure rates are reasonable and conditions of supply are non-discriminatory.

3. Rate of return that assures the continuing viability of the operation.

4. If the monopoly provider also provides facilities or services in a competitive environment, it is essential that regulatory safeguards are in place to prevent cross-subsidies from flowing between the two operations."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(11) EJCH's Position (Reference Pg. 8, EJCH Summation)

"The 'electronic pathway' should be provided by a common carrier and be subject to regulation by the Board as to rates and tariffs for use, and access to the network. Such services required to provide the electronic pathway should be defined as basic services. The common carrier should be precluded from providing from within the corporate structure of the common carrier any non-basic services. The second side of the telecommunications model should be competitive and not be subject to regulation by the Board. All non-basic services should be within this side of the model."

(12) CAC's Position

CAC did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that the "Subjects of Inquiry" excepting Basic Cable Television Service are Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. Accordingly, no market entry regulation is required.

The Board considers that all providers of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should file tariffs with the Board for the Board's acknowledgement so that the Board may monitor the marketplace price regulation.

The Board considers that all providers of transmission or distribution networks should obtain construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity wherein the merits of such proposals can be examined with regard to the public interest.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(f) Type of Regulation (Issue #6) (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board considers that providers of only origination/termination equipment need not be regulated by the Board.

The Board considers that providers who provide both Basic and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should file Contribution Tests to ensure that Basic Telecommunications Services do not subsidize Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7)

What model(s) is in the best interest of the public for the provision of "Public or Private Information Services" considering the present and potential roles and relationships between information producers, information packagers, originating/terminating facility providers and transmission/distribution facility providers?

Participants' Positions

The Participants were in general agreement that there should be competition with respect to Public or Private Information Services. Agreement was qualified in some cases by recommending a separation between "carriage" and "content" or recommending that the carriage service be provided over a single integrated network.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) AGT's Position (References Pg. 11,12, Exhibit 1, AGT (CNCP) 6 Information Response and AGT (EJCH) Information Response)

"The Public and Private Information Services listed in Appendix B.5 of the submission guidelines will require several different provisioning models..."
"The production, collection and/or packaging of information will be done by one or more of a large variety of organizations. The distribution function could be done by utilizing existing transmission/distribution facilities. Such services could also be transmitted from either terrestial or satellite transmitters.
The provisioning of originating/terminating equipment will also be provided by a variety of organizations. It is conceivable that the production, packaging and distribution of information, as well as the provision of origination/terminating equipment could be done by a single organization for a particular service. We believe it to be more probable that there will be a division between carriage and content, each being handled by a different provider.

AGT envisions an integrated distribution network and has not as yet been able to clearly define the part each carrier will play in this, but does see the cable companies as having a potential role in the provision and packaging of information and some other services...

...AGT is also investigating the concept of an integrated network which will replace copper pairs and co-axial cable with fibre optic cable, capable of working in conjunction with an appropriate unified switching network. However the technological and economic feasibility of any of these systems is still subject to evaluation."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference Pg. 15, Exhibit 40)

"The public interest can best be served if only one provider controls the network and makes this available to all end users. This arrangement would allow for competition in the supply of a large number of services operated through the use of the network owned by 'edmonton telephones' in its area..."

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 34, Exhibit 12)

"The separation of carriage and content is becoming more and more unnecessary. There are vendors of information who have no desire to deal with a multiplicity of customers and would sooner have someone else market their product. ..."
"These services require different marketing techniques and as yet these are to be determined. To say that the market structure should segregate 'content' and 'carriage' is preconditioning the system for a marketing arrangement. There has to be flexibility for 'entrepreneurship' so that the savings of time, manpower, energy and materials will be realized."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 18, Exhibit 10)

"...a model that fostered the maximum degree of competition ... The model would envisage equitable access by all potential participants to the transmission/distribution facilities of the telecommunication system in Alberta. The model should not be established upon any traditional or artificial base premise involving, for example, separation of 'carriage' and 'content', because in many instances in order for optimum advantage to be derived from the system it will be necessary for those primarily responsible for transmission/ distribution to also assume responsibility for originating and/or packaging some of the information distributed on the system. ..."

"...The C.C.T.A. believes that, to the extent possible, the competitive market place provides the most fair and efficient method of rate regulation."

"...The regulatory body would also have jurisdiction over the terms and conditions of the arrangements that would exist between the information producers, and/or information packagers and/or originating/termination facility providers on the one hand, and the providers of transmission/distribution facilities on the other hand."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 31, Exhibit 35)

"I would submit that the kind of workable competition model I have attempted to describe is in the best interest of the public. I am skeptical about the separation between 'carriage' and 'content' in the context of the services covered under this question, except for descriptive purposes. The tendency to confine certain types of firms to either carriage or content services is artificial and seems to me to reflect, in large part, a lack of faith in the ability of the regulatory process to prevent unfair competition if carriage suppliers were to be allowed to enter content-related services."

(6) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 23-26, Exhibit 17)

"CBEMA believes that the provision of 'Public or Private Information Services', which may or may not use telecommunication services, should be permitted to develop in a competitive environment, unregulated, and with minimum government intervention. The relationships between information producers, information packagers, originating/terminating facility providers, and transmission distribution facility providers should be normal business contractual relationships.

Where transmission/distribution facilities are provided by a regulated telecommunications carrier, the relationship between those providing public or private information service and the telecommunications carrier should be a normal user/carrier relationship. The carrier should provide telecommunication services of the user's choice, on a non-discriminatory basis, and under appropriate tariff terms and conditions."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(6) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 23-26, Exhibit 17) (Continued)

"It is CBEMA's position that this model should continue to be encouraged. It benefits both the providers of public and private information services, and those who use the services provided. The competitive environment on which this model is based gives wide opportunity and choice to the providers of services, and brings to users the benefits of innovative services, lower costs, increased choice and service responsiveness.

...telecommunications carrier must provide telecommunications services to its competitive activities, and to other competitors engaged in similar activities, on a basis that will assure fair and equal treatment. In addition, we believe the carrier's competitive operations must be conducted through a separate subsidiary, with complete accounting separation between the regulated operation of the carrier and the subsidiary. Without such separation, there is a danger of cross-subsidization. ...

...CBEMA believe that in order to prevent the danger of cross-subsidization on which we have already commented, there should be separation, through subsidiary organizations and appropriate account controls, of the normal CATV activities and activities involving information services. In addition, we believe that if a CATV controls and provides information services, its facilities for transmission should be made available on an equal basis to others who wish to provide competitive information services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) EJCH's Position (Refernce Pg. 2 (E.2), Exhibit 15)

"We believe the model for information services which would best serve the public interest is a competitive one; the model which would be most detrimental to the public interest is a monopoly one."

EJCH - The Competitive Model (Reference Pgs. 3 - 4

Exhibit 15)

"Because of the rapidly-decreasing costs of data processing equipment necessary to support these kinds of services, and assuming free access to common carrier networks, we would also expect the future information services market to be a highly competitive one."

"Within this competitive model, the computer-based origination facilities would, of course, be in the hands of the information vendors. It would also follow, if the present dial-up information services are used as a model, that there should be a free market in remote terminal equipment.

This, it seems to use, would form the basis for a fair and equitable division of 'carriage' and 'content' which would most efficiently utilize a common carrier network while retaining the advantage of a free and competitive climate for the provision of information services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) EJCH's Position (Continued)

EJCH - The Monopoly Model (Reference Pgs 4 - 9, Exhibit 15)

"This model would result from a decision by a telecommunications common carrier, with the consent of the appropriate regulatory authority, to set up its own data processing equipment for the purpose of providing information services in a way that purposely excluded other information services vendors from interconnection with the carrier's network on a fair and equal basis.

The Monopoly Model,...would have the following major detrimental effects...

(a) The arbitrary denial of logical development opportunities for existing enterprises...

(b) The discouragement of comprehensive, competitive local new services...

(c) The discouragement of competitive local advertising distribution services...

(d) The discouragement of innovation in the supply of information services...

(e) The loss of protection now provided to the general public by price competition in the provision of information services...

(f) The loss of freedom of expression for information producers...

(g) The possible creation of confusion in the assessment of legal liability for information distributed by way of a carrier monopoly..."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(8) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position respecting this Issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(g) Public or Private Information Services (Issue #7) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers it is in the public interest to have competition in all respects for Public or Private Information Services. Information production, information packaging and origination/termination equipment provision should all be open to competition. Furthermore, all information providers must be assured equitable access to the transmission and distribution networks. The public will benefit from diversity of choice, price competition and innovation in the provision of these Services.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(h) Data Processing (Issue #8)

What forms of data processing are included or should be included in the subjects B.1 (d) "Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage" and B.5 "Public or Private Information Services"?

Participants' Positions

Participants generally agreed that the carrier should exercise no control over or have knowledge of the information content carried on the network unless the carrier is the provider of the information.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 12, Exhibit 1)

"'Public or Private Information Services' may necessitate data processing in more than one form. Data may be processed by information producers during the procedure of generating information, or by information packagers. Data may also be processed as a result of subscriber utilization of the service. In some cases it may be expedient for the carrier to process the information, and AGT would then expect to do so."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"'edmonton telephones' presently supplies Carriage of Data Information and envisions a similar responsibility under the Integrated Network Concept."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(h) Data Processing (Issue #8) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 36, Exhibit 12)

"For those services which are non-interactive there is no need for data processing, however, in some of the interactive services such as buying/selling systems and banking systems, data manipulation is an integral part of the service."

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 21, Exhibit 10)

"The C.C.T.A. believes it would perhaps be premature to attempt to develop a strict definition of those alpha-numeric services which should be classified as being part of Public or Private Information Services and those that should be included under the heading 'Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage'..."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 37, Exhibit 35)

"...Any form of data processing and all information services should be regarded as candidates for competitive supply...Major suppliers of data processing or information services should be given the option, subject to certain entry conditions, to build carriage facilities if carriage services are not available to them from other suppliers on reasonable terms."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(h) Data Processing (Issue #8) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(6) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 28, Exhibit 17)

"Regarding B.5, 'Public or Private Information Services', since these are data processing services, and as such should be provided under conditions of maximum competition, any or all forms of data processing presumably could be included."

(7) EJCH's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 15)

"It is our position that telecommunications common carriers should be excluded from any direct involvement in public information processing (including the provision of directory information for such services), but should have the entire responsibility for public communications processing."

(8) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(h) Data Processing (Issue #8) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that in some cases data processing is an integral part of Data Signal Carriage. However, in both Data Signal Carriage and Public or Private Information Services, the carrier should not have control of the data or message content unless the carrier is the provider of the information.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9)

What forms of origination/termination interconnection arrangements are in the public interest with respect to each of the "Subjects of Inquiry"?

Participants' Positions

All Participants were in general agreement that a liberal origination/termination interconnection policy respecting Non-Basic Telecommunications Services was in the public interest provided that the technical integrity of the common carrier's network was not impaired. AGT qualified their agreement to include the question of economic harm to the Basic Telecommunications Services Customer.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 87, AGT Summation)

"Therefore AGT submits that terminal interconnection applications relative to AGT should be subject to:

i. type approval, possibly by an independent body,

ii. AGT approval, after engineering and other studies, and

iii. Board approval, when it has been determined that no technical or economic harm will accrue to the basic service users."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"Certain interconnection devices that are deemed necessary by the common carrier to protect the integrity of the integrated network."

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 38, Exhibit 12)

"The CTAA are not predisposed to insisting on controlling the terminating hardware. Our industry has historically permitted any device to be connected to its service. The customer has made that choice. In interactive services however, we might require some level of control to maintain security and system integrity. This might be a preferred suppliers list and some means of controlling the "address" of the device connected to the service."

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pgs 21 & 22, Exhibit 10)

"Generally speaking, the C.C.T.A. is in favor of a liberal interconnection policy, but there may be some instances in which it would be in the public interest to allow the common carrier or the broadcast-receiving undertaking to decide whether it wishes to retain a degree of control over specific terminal facilities. As indicated above, the C.C.T.A. believes this ownership option should be retained by the common carrier or the broadcast-receiving undertaking to facilitate installation, servicing and maintenance of terminal equipment used in connection with fire, police, medical and other emergency alarm systems, and with most other public or private remote monitoring services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 33, Exhibit 35)

"Any interconnection arrangement in this area is in the public interest so long as the arrangement provides for reasonable standards regarding technical quality and safety. It is, I would submit, appropriate to make it an obligation of suppliers of basic (or monopoly) services to permit such interconnection arrangements subject to these conditions being met, and these arrangements should be available on non-discriminatory terms."

(6) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pgs 30 & 31, CRCCA Summation)

"...the Association submits that this Board in its Report to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council of Alberta under the terms of reference of this inquiry recommend as follows:

1. That it is in the public interest that competition be preserved with respect to mobile communication services.

2. That the preservation of such competition will require the granting of interconnection rights between licensed Radio Common Carriers, licensed by the Minister of Communications pursuant to the Radio Act with the public switched network of Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 5, Motorola Summation)

"With respect to Mobile Services it has been Motorola's submission that mobile communication services, whether one-way paging or two-way radio telephone services, are competitive service offerings in the Province of Alberta. In response to issue 10, Motorola submits that it is in the public interest to permit mobile communication systems licensed by the Federal Department of Communications pursuant to The Radio Act to be interconnected with the public switched network of AGT and Edmonton Telephones."

(8) TAS' Position (Reference Pgs. 1 & 2, TAS Summation)

"...the telephone companies are in a position to offer direct dial paging which TAS Communications and the other licensed Radio Common Carriers are not permitted to do.

It is the respectful submission of TAS Communications that this preference being accorded by AGT and Edmonton Tel to themselves constitutes an unfair competitive advantage. In the Company's submission this is particularly inappropriate as radio paging has been declared to be a non-basic service in the case of AGT with the result that the telephone company's offerings are unregulated as to price. In TAS' submission a critical assumption in such regulatory procedure is that competition be fair and equal between competitors so that subscribers are thereby assured of a reasonable price and service offering."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 29, Exhibit 17)

"Technical specifications must be developed and some form of certification, registration or other means established to assure compliance and ensure that the origination/termination equipment will not harm the carriers' facilities or personnel."

(10) CAC's Position (Reference Pg. 4, CAC Summation)

"In order that interconnection can be brought about here in Alberta, CAC strenuously urges the PUB to recommend to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council that The Alberta Government Telephones Act, Sec.28, be changed in such a way that it will allow interconnection as long as those interconnecting follow the rules and guidelines that may be set out by the company so that the equipment connected will not harm that of the company's."

(11) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not specifically take a position regarding this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board generally favours interconnection arrangements that will enhance effective competition in the provision of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

The Board recommends that a liberal policy in respect to the interconnection of origination/termination equipment associated with Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should be adopted.

The Board recommends that fair and reasonable terms and conditions be established by providers of Basic Telecommunications Services networks to protect the technical integrity of the Basic Telecommunications Services networks. The Board considers that competition in the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should not be restricted by unreasonable terms and conditions imposed by providers of Basic Telecommunications Services networks in respect to interconnection of origination/ termination equipment.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(i) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection (Issue #9) (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board recommends that where parties cannot mutually agree to acceptable terms and conditions that the Board be given the regulatory authority to adjudicate such disputes.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10)

What forms of transmission/distribution facilities interconnection arrangements are in the public interest with respect to each of the "Subjects of Inquiry"?

Participants' Positions

All the Participants were in general agreement that there would be cases where the interconnection of transmission/distribution systems would be in the public interest.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 89, AGT Summation)

"Consideration should be given, in the assessment of the impact of systems interconnection upon the public interest, to ensure that there is no technical harm to the network or economic harm to the basic service users."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"Technical standards have to be developed by the Telecommunications Industry to allow for the efficient interconnection of neighbouring jurisdictions of the Integrated Network."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Participants Positions

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 39, Exhibit 12)

"The CTAA see the possibility of some like service being offered over different transmission systems in different communities. It is conceivable that three different carriers could utilize three different technical systems for the same service. It may be important for the vendor of the service to have these different systems interconnected. The interconnection will probably be made through an electronic buffer, which may be a computer, or at the minimum a digital convertor. The vendor of the service would have the responsibility of providing this device for interconnecting dissimilar data streams."

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 22, Exhibit 10)

"The CCTA believes that the public interest and the interest of its member companies is best served by a policy which encourages interconnection arrangements amongst undertakings operating telecommunication transmission/ distribution facilities since such arrangements serve to facilitate equitable competition between the providers of such services and to increase the range of options for users of such transmission/ distribution facilities."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 3, CNCP Summation)

"It is the position of CNCP Telecommunications that access to the switched local distribution system of the telephone networks is essential to effective and fair and equal competition in data communications and private line voice services. The regulatory environment should provide for necessary connections, absent inter-carrier co-operation and for the fairness of the terms and conditions upon which the connections are to be made."

(6) SP's Position (Reference Pg. 5, SP Summation)

"Southern Pacific submits that interconnection between the facilities of Specialized Carriers offering what have been determined to be non-basic services and the switched network of the monopoly carrier is in the public interest and it will encourage competition. Such competition, in Southern Pacific's submission, will reduce the costs of these specialized services to subscribers and encourage the innovation of new services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pg. 16, Exhibit 26)

"In summary, it is the submission of the Association that this Board recommend that Alberta Government Telephones and Edmonton Telephones cease discrimination against licensed radio common carriers and granting themselves an undue preference by refusing to supply outpulsing service to their competitors in both radio paging and mobile radio services. Such recommendation, in the Associaton's submission, will preserve the competitive strength of the industry and enable licensed radio common carriers to continue to offer the subscribers in Alberta a competitive alternative in terms of product, price, quality and service."

(8) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 10, Exhibit 25)

"As we have already explained, private mobile services cannot be interconnected except under conditions favourable to the carrier which include carrier ownership of the interconnecting terminal equipment. This requirement precludes completely any competitive negotiation between the user and the various suppliers. The market for this type of service has been foreclosed by AGT. Public mobile service (mobile telephone) has been available and should continue to be available on a competitive basis."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) TAS Position (Reference Pg. 4, Exhibit 28)

"If the telephone companies were prepared to supply these telephone numbers known as selector level telephone numbers or NNX codes to TAS Communications and other licensed radio common carriers, the Company would be in a position to compete fairly with the telephone companies..."

(10) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 31, Exhibit 17)

"We believe that the CRTC decision concerning interconnection of CNCPT and Bell Canada facilities can be used as a guideline for the form that future such arrangements should follow. The principles applied are:

1. The interconnected service should not be designed to compete with the monopoly service to which it is connecting.

2. Technical standards for interconnecting should be established by the providers of the two services.

3. The charges for the interconnection should be related to the true costs of the service to which connection is made. This is to ensure that the users of the monopoly service also benefit from the interconnection."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(11) CAC's Position (Reference Pg. 2, CAC Summation)

"With more than one common carrier supplying transmission facilities and more than one common carrier of distribution facilities there would be full and open competition by those taking part. For this to take place then, there must be interconnection."

(12) EJCH's Position

The EJCH did not take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(j) Transmission/Distribution Systems Interconnection (Issue #10) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that interconnection of Transmission/Distribution Systems should be allowed in those cases where it is necessary to ensure effective competition in the provision of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

Sections 99 and 100 of The PUB Act currently provide that applications for system interconnection may be made to the Board and the Board may make any order that it deems proper.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(k) Leasing/Resale (Issue #11)

What forms of leasing of common carrier facilities for resale purposes are in the public interest with respect to each of the "Subjects of Inquiry"?

Participants' Positions

All participants generally agreed that the leasing and resale of Transmission/Distribution facilities is in the public interest. AGT's agreement was qualified by recommending that each case be judged on its own merits.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 14, Exhibit 1)

"Each case of leasing of common carrier facilities must be judged on its own merits, using as a criterion that if a value added carrier can provide a service better than the common carrier can or will, without causing to the carrier economic harm which would prevent equitable treatment for all Albertans, then resale could be in the public interest."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"Resale of channels on the integrated network should create innovation and competition in the marketplace, however, leasing arrangements must continue to be compensatory to the common carrier."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(k) Leasing/Resale (Issue #11) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 40, Exhibit 12)

"The CTAA expect to be reselling transmission capacity on a limited basis in direct competition with 'common carriers' and as such could be classified as a 'carrier'. We would not have all the features of a 'common carrier'. We would be selective in the services added, particularly because the terminal equipment used would have to be compatible with existing system hardware."

(4) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 33, Exhibit 35)

"The public interest is served by leasing of common carrier facilities for the purpose of promoting the supply of competitive services. Leasing terms should be such as to avoid restraints on this competition. In terms of local non-broadcasting services, leasing is likely to become far less of an issue than the terms of access to the basic-service network in order to supply customers of competitive services."

(5) SP's Position (Reference Pg. 20, Exhibit 31)

"It is a submission of Southern Pacific that the resale of common carrier facilities is in the public interest. Such resale permits greater utilization of existing common carrier facilities, the provisioning of alternative services to subscribers at minimum cost and promotes competition with respect to competitive telecommunication services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(k) Leasing/Resale (Issue #11) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(6) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 12, Exhibit 25)

"In connection with subjects B.3 and B.4 there are requirements whereby basic carrier facilities can be employed as part of a total system involving non-carrier facilities on a interconnected basis. The carrier facilities used may be multiplexed or shared so as to increase their utilization in the system employed and offered to the user. This is a form of innovation and is a form of competitive offering which should be allowed."

(7) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 34, Exhibit 17)

"We believe that sharing and resale are socially beneficial because they result in more efficient use of transmission facilities and lower costs to users. We further believe that sharing and resale will promote greater use and application of computers and communications. These benefits will broaden the market for equipment and services used in such environments. This in turn will result in greater innovation, with reduced costs and increased efficiency for the users."

(8) Other Participants' Positions

The other participants did not take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(k) Leasing/Resale (Issue #11) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board recommends that the sale for resale of any of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should be permitted as it would further enhance competition in the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services area.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(1) Tariffs Publication (Issue #12)

Is it in the public interest to require all providers of local non-broadcasting telecommunications services to publish tariffs which are available for public inspection?

Participants' Positions

The participants were not in agreement respecting the publication of tariffs.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 16, Exhibit 1)

"We believe that tariffs should be available for public inspection, but should be subject to regulation only when this is demonstrable in the public interest."

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"'edmonton telephones' believes that basic monopoly service tariffs should be published and available for Public scrutiny. Competitive services pricing, however, should not be Public Information as these Price Levels are established by the marketplace."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(1) Tariffs Publication (Issue #12) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 41, Exhibit 12)

"Yes, this would be useful."

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 23, Exhibit 10)

"The CCTA knows of no reason why all providers of local non-broadcasting telecommunication services should not publish tariffs which are available for public inspection. Currently the CRTC establishes a permissible maximum rate that licensed cable television undertakings may charge to their subscribers for an approved package of services: that maximum rate is published by the Commission and is a condition of licence of the system."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 34, Exhibit 35)

"The answer to this question is yes, given that published tariffs are a prerequisite to fair competition in an industry in which firms possessing monopoly status in some services are to be allowed to supply competitive services employing facilities that are also used for monopoly services. In fairness, this requirement on some firms should be extended to its competitors."

(6) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 12, Exhibit 25)

"When the services offered are regulated then they should be supported by published tariffs."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(1) Tariffs Publication (Issue #12) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 35, Exhibit 17)

"Where it is established that a local non-broadcasting telecommunication service has the characteristics of a natural monopoly and that the public interest would be served by restricting entry into the provision of this service, then it becomes necessary to subject the provider(s) of the service to regulation. One of the functions of this regulation is to assure that the service is provided to all on a non-discriminatory basis. Under these conditions, CBEMA believes it is in the public interest that the provider(s) of the service publish tariffs which are available for public inspection. Tariffs should not be required for all other services."

(8) CAC's Position (Reference Pg. 4, CAC Summation)

"CAC's answer is an emphatic Yes. It is one of the best ways for a consumer to do comparison pricing and to be sure he knows all the facts about what is being sold to him before he buys the new product or service. We believe that no matter what product or service is being offered, the prices should be published, be it for a telecommunication service or product or hiring a lawyer."

(9) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(1) Tariffs Publication (Issue #12) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board recommends that it monitor the marketplace price regulation by requiring the filing of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services rates with the Board for acknowledgement. Such filings would be available for public inspection.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13)

What revenue/cost tests are available for regulatory purposes to ensure that competitive and/or non-basic services do not adversely affect monopolistic and/or basic services?

Participants' Positions

The merits of "Contribution Tests" were discussed at the hearing and in summation, six Participants (CNCP, SP, CRCCA, MOTOROLA, TAS and EJCH) took the position that Basic Telecommunications Services providers should only be allowed to offer Non-Basic Telecommunications Services by way of a separate arms length subsidiary.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 95, AGT Summation)

"AGT submits that in the context of its regulation an Individual Profitability Test (or Net Present Value Test) - a forward looking incremental revenue and cost study - and a Contribution Test - a historical incremental revenue and cost study - are appropriate for regulatory purposes to ensure that competitive and/or Non-Basic Services do not adversely affect monopolistic and/or Basic Services. AGT believes similar tests are appropriate for other providers of telecommunication services and therefore consideration should be given to require all providers of both monopoly and competitive services to perform an approved revenue and cost study to demonstrate that monopoly services do not subsidize competitive services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"A contribution test for each competitive or non-basic service should be filed with the appropriate regulator at defined intervals on a confidential basis to ensure that these services are not being cross-subsidized by basic services."

(3) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 42, Exhibit 12)

"In responding to this issue, the CTAA reiterates its position that the Board has no jurisdiction to regulate any of the 'Subjects of Inquiry' to the extent that they are provided by a Federally licensed and regulated provider. Competitive and/or non-basic services must bear the incremental costs which they impose. An incremental cost contribution test could be used to determine that the competitive and/or non-basic services are 'paying their own way'. Mention has already been made of the need to insure that basic services do not subsidize competitive services but the importance of that need cannot be overstated. The result of such subsidization would be the elimination of the competition which the public interest requires."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(4) CCTA's Position (Reference Pg. 6, CCTA Summation)

"It is submitted that the fundamental element of the regulatory philosophies of both the CRTC and this Board with regard to the provisioning of non basic, local non-broadcasting telecommunication services is that there shall be no cross subsidization of the revenues from the 'basic' to the 'non basic' services. The CCTA therefore believes that the current system of regulation provides an acceptable framework for equitable competition in the provisioning of local non-broadcasting telecommunication services in Alberta."

(5) CNCP's Position (Reference Pg. 9, CNCP Reply to Summation)

"The most effective means of guarding against harmful cross-subsidization is accounting separation and structural separation of the monopoly and competitive service sectors. The formulation of what might be considered an 'approved revenue and cost study' is by no means a simple task and has to date defied all attempts."

(6) SP's Position (Reference Pg. 15, SP Summation)

"With respect to these competitive or non-basic services, it is submitted that the regulated common carrier such as AGT be permitted to offer and compete in the area without regulation provided the offerings are carried out by a separate arms length subsidiary. The Board may also require for informational purposes essentially, that the monopoly carrier file a statement outlining the rates charged for those services from time to time and a contribution test detailing the revenues and costs related to competitive services."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(7) CRCCA's Position (Reference Pg. 31 & 32, CRCCA Summation)

"That in order to ensure that there will be continued fair competition with respect to mobile radio communications and other competitive offerings of Alberta Government Telephones and that there will not be cross subsidization to the detriment of subscribers to monopoly services or to the detriment of the competitors who might suffer from predatory pricing, Alberta Government Telephones be required to offer all non-basic or competitive services through a separate arms length subsidiary."

(8) MOTOROLA's Position (Reference Pg. 59 & 60, Motorola Summation)

"In summary, Motorola submits that non-basic services be regulated in the current fashion but that a contribution test in meaningful detail be filed and annually reviewed by the Board. This material should be readily available to the public. In addition, Motorola submits that all non basic services currently identified in the non basic tariff filed with the Board be offered to the public through a separate arms length subsidiary. Motorola supports the views of the Federal Communications Commissions and a number of the participants in this Inquiry that the separate subsidiary concept is a necessary complement to a proper Contribution Test."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13) (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(9) TAS Position (Reference Pg. 17, TAS Summation)

"Finally, it is submitted that this Board should recommend that all non-basic services, including radio paging, furnished by AGT in competition with others, be supplied through a separate arms length subsidiary."

(10) CBEMA's Position (Reference Pg. 38, Exhibit 17)

"A carrier may offer data processing services through a separate corporation which it controls or in which it otherwise has a direct or indirect interest, provided that such separate corporation maintains its own books of account and accounts separately for personnel, premises and equipment. The separate corporation shall not be required to file tariffs for such offerings."

(11) EJCH's Position (Reference Pg. 5, EJCH Summation)

"The EJCH submit that where the competitive aspects of non-basic services are being provided by a common carrier, such provision should be by an arms length subsidiary. Such 'separation' gives an immediate appearance of equitable competition and equitable access to the network; would preclude in the absence of fraud or inappropriate and unauthorized business practices cross subsidization; and avoids the appearance of an artificial separation within one entity."

(12) CAC's Position

CAC did not take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(m) Prevention of Cross-Subsidization (Issue #13) (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board is not persuaded, at this time, that providers of Basic Telecommunications Services who also provide or wish to provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services should provide those services through an arms-length subsidiary. The Board considers that appropriate regulation will ensure that any benefits from providing Non-Basic Telecommunications Services will flow through to the Basic Telecommunications Services customer.

The Board recommends that providers who provide both Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services be required to file a Contribution Test for the collective total of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to ensure that Basic Telecommunications Services are not cross-subsidizing the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

Issues #1 through #13 were identified by the Board in the Submission Guidelines of August 1, 1979. Participants were encouraged to state their positions respecting additional matters deserving attention. Three issues follow which arose during the Inquiry which the Board considers were not specifically addressed in the original thirteen issues.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(n) Obligation to Serve

Should the providers of Telecommunications Services operating within Alberta be under any obligation to provide service?

Participants' Positions

The telephone companies agreed that providers of Telecommunications Services should operate under the same conditions of obligation.

(1) AGT's Position (Reference Pg. 21, AGT Summation)

"In any case where a company is under an obligation to provide a service, any other company wishing to provide the same service may only do so under the same obligation."

and further (Reference Pg. 29, AGT Summation)

"The mandate also carries with it the obligation to ensure that basic telecommunication services are available throughout all the province, including not only urban areas but also the wide spread rural and remote regions which are more costly to serve."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(n) Obligation to Serve (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(2) 'et''s Position (Reference City of Edmonton/'et' Summation - Appendix B)

"A telecommunications common carrier in return for obtaining exclusive rights within a particular geographic area has the obligation to provide telecommunications services to those within the area when so requested."

(3) Other Participants' Positions

All other Participants did not take a position respecting this issue.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(n) Obligation to Serve (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that the question of an obligation to serve must be considered separately for Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. It is the Board's position that a provider of Basic Telecommunications Services does have an obligation to provide service at just and reasonable rates to any financially responsible party within its franchise area who requests such service.

Generally, a provider of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services does not have an obligation to provide service. However, in special circumstances, the Board may find it appropriate to order such a provider to provide, or continue to provide Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(o) Pay Television

What regulatory framework should there be for pay television systems?

Participants' Positions

Although pay television was ignored for the most part, it did generate some comment from the CTAA. The following excerpts from transcript are part of the examination of a witness for the CTAA by the Presiding Member:

(1) CTAA's Position (Reference Pg. 1743, lines 19-27, Pg. 1744, lines 2-9, 22-27, Pg. 1745, lines 2-16)

"A Yes, I think that the way that the CRTC may be looking at it is that pay television is a potentially competitive undertaking to off-air broadcasting and because it is they would consider pay television as an undertaking that they would want to control because it would have impact on over-the-air television --

Q. Can I just stop you there for a moment. Is the concern, now I'm coming back to your concern that you mentioned in 31, are they concerned about the impact of that sector as being the same as an impact of non-basic on basic. Is that what the CRTC is concerned with? Not programming, but the basic and non-basic cross-subsidization issue?"

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(o) Pay Television (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) CTAA's Position (Continued)

"A No. No, I think they are worried about the impact of pay television as carried on the cable television system on the over-the-air broadcasting system and for that reason they tend to treat it as a broadcasting service rather than a non-broadcasting service."

"A The difference is under the rules of the CRTC and the licensing arrangements they have no control over hotel television. They do have control of our licenses and to that extent would try to control pay television as offered over cable television undertakings. The impact of the hotel television system definitely has an impact over-the-air broadcasting but as currently arranged they have no way of forbidding it.

Q So if I understand you correctly their concern is not cross-subsidization between basic and non-basic?

A No.

Q Their concern --

A Is sort of esoteric. It relates to the Canadian Broadcasting System.

Q Would the concern be with content of that movie, is that why they also want to gain control?"

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(o) Pay Television (Continued)

Participants' Positions (Continued)

(1) CTAA's Position (Continued)

"A No, I don't think they are particularly concerned with the content of the entertainment value that it would detract from the over-the-air broadcasting. They also have some other concerns which are social. They want to establish a Canadian production community. They want to give work to the Canadian artists and a number of other social objectives."

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(o) Pay Television (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers Pay Television Service to be a potential Non-Basic Telecommunications Service of the Cable Television Companies and perhaps others. As such it would be merely one of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services offered by the Cable Television Companies and subject only to the Contribution Test as far as regulation by this Board is concerned.

Pay Television Service may also be provided by off-air broadcasters or other parties.

The Board should not have the responsibility for regulating the content of Pay Television Systems.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(p) Consistent Regulation

Is it in the public interest to have a consistent regulatory framework for the provision of Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta?

Participants' Positions

Participants generally favored consistent regulation. However, all Participants who expressed such an opinion did not agree that this Board be the sole authority for such "consistent" regulation.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(p) Consistent Regulation (Continued)

Board's Position

The Board considers that all companies providing Basic Telecommunications Services within Alberta should come under full Board jurisdiction to ensure a consistent approach to telecommunications regulation and to ensure that equitable regulation principles are employed.

Cable Television Companies have been granted a franchise area (territorial) monopoly by the CRTC for the provision of Television Program Carriage. The Board considers that such a monopoly status categorizes the franchise holder as a provider of Basic Telecommunications Services.

'et' also offers Telephone Service as a monopoly service within the City of Edmonton, a status which the Board considers necessary for categorization as a Basic Telecommunications Services.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(p) Consistent Regulation (Continued)

Board's Position (Continued)

The Board considers it mandatory that consistent regulation by this Board be applied to all Telephone Companies and Cable Television Companies in the Province of Alberta.

The Board considers that consistent regulation can best be achieved if all providers of Basic Telecommunications Services are brought under the full jurisdiction of the Board.

8. THE ISSUES (Continued)

(q) Satellite Receiving Antennae

Should satellite receiving antennae be regulated by the Board?

General

The status of Satellite Receiving Antennae was not raised as an issue during the Inquiry. Nevertheless, the Board considers it appropriate to express its position on this subject in this Report.

Board's Position

The Board considers that privately owned satellite receiving antennae which are located on the owner's property and for the owner's use only should not be regulated by the Board.

However, the Board considers that satellite receiving antennae connected to cable distribution facilities for distribution to the public should be subject to the regulatory authority of the Board. This would include market entry, construction and operating certification and the filing requirements required of all providers of such Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

(a) General

The Board considers that the complex issues arising out of the provision of telecommunications physical plant and Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services in the Province of Alberta can be resolved through the judicious application of appropriate regulatory principles including deregulation where circumstances warrant it.

The Board recommends that all providers of telecommunications physical plant and Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services within the Province of Alberta be subject to the same regulatory framework in order to provide a consistent approach to telecommunications regulation and to ensure that equitable regulatory principles are employed.

A detailed description of the type of regulation recommended with respect to providers of Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services follows in this Section. Reference may be made to Appendix 13 which summarizes in table form the recommended regulatory framework.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(b) Categorization of Services

The Board considers that all Telecommunications Services should be divided into two categories - Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. The Board recommends that it be given the authority to determine the division between Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. Recognizing that, in the future, it may be appropriate to move some Telecommunications Services from one category to the other, the Board would hold hearings to determine if such changes in categorization were warranted.

The Board considers that Basic Telecommunications Services are those services which generally have monopolistic attributes and/or which are generally considered as an essential public service.

The Board considers that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services are those services for which there is more than one provider and which are not generally considered to be an essential public service.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(b) Categorization of Services (Continued)

The Board considers that providers of only origination/ termination equipment need not be regulated by the Board.

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services

The Board recommends that all Telecommunications Services categorized as Basic Telecommunications Services be fully regulated by the Board. All parties providing or wishing to provide such Basic Services should come under the Board's jurisdiction.

The Board recommends that the current providers of Basic Telecommunications Services (AGT, 'et' and the Cable Television Companies) should have the following functions regulated by the Board:

(1) Basic Service Rates

- Board approval of Basic Service Rates using the common regulatory process of rate base, rate of return, revenue requirement and rate structure approval.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(2) Franchise Approval

- Board approval of franchise agreements between municipalities and providers of Basic Telecommunications Services pursuant to Section 270 (1) of The MG Act and Sections 94 and 95 of The PUB Act.

(3) Systems Interconnection

- Board approval of systems interconnection including any basic network access rate.
- Board adjudication of any disputes when parties cannot mutally agree on terms and conditions of systems interconnection.

(4) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection

- Board approval of origination/termination equipment interconnection including basic network access rate.
- Board adjudication of any disputes when parties cannot mutually agree on terms and conditions of origination/termination equipment interconnection.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(5) Quality of Service

- Board approval of type and grade of service pursuant to accepted industry/public standards
- Board monitoring of productivity improvements.

(6) Safety

- Board supervision of safe construction and operating procedures to ensure compliance with the law.

(7) System of Accounts

- Board approval of system of accounts.

(8) Rules and Regulations

- Board approval of terms and conditions and other rules and regulations pertaining to the provision of Basic Telecommunications Services.

(9) Financing Approval

- Board approval of financing arrangements pursuant to Sections 87(1)(e) and 87(1)(g) of The PUB Act.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

(10) Construction/Extension of Transmission/ Distribution Networks

- Board issuance of construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity.

(11) Siting and Rights of Way.

(12) Attachments (Pole and duct space).

The Board recommends that it be given the authority to regulate 'et', the Cable Television Companies and any other company or person which is involved in the provision of Basic Telecommunications Services.

The authority given to the Board should include the control of market entry. Decisions on whether or not to allow additional companies to provide any Basic Telecommunications Services would be made following public hearings.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(c) Regulation of Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity for the extension or reinforcement of any transmission or distribution network required for the purposes of providing Basic Telecommunications Services. The Board considers these certificates necessary to ensure the overall economic, orderly and efficient development of telecommunications services, to ensure safe and efficient practices and to ensure protection of the environment and the public. The certification process would include holding public hearings at which the merits of the construction proposal would be evaluated.

The Board recommends that it should regulate only the "carriage" function of the Basic Telecommunications Services and that the regulation of "content" if and where considered necessary should be regulated by other appropriate bodies.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services

The Board recommends that all of the Subjects of Inquiry with the exception of Basic Television Services (B.2(a) Cable Television Systems and B.2(b) Community Antenna Television Systems), should be considered Non-Basic Telecommunications Services. The recommended Non-Basic Telecommunications Services are listed in Appendix 11.

The Board recommends that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services be regarded as competitive service offerings. Accordingly, the Board recommends that there be no market entry regulation respecting providers of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

The Board recommends that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services not be price regulated by the Board as long as the marketplace provides appropriate price regulation.

The Board recommends that it monitor the marketplace price regulation by requiring the filing of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services rates with the Board for acknowledgement.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(d) Regulation of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services (Continued)

The Board considers that it has the regulatory authority (pursuant to Section 70.1 of The PUB Act) to exempt providers of Non-Basic Telecommunications Services from public utility status and to declare Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to be exempt from price regulation.

The Board considers that Non-Basic Telecommunications Services need only be regulated by the Board with respect to the construction or extension of any transmission/ distribution network associated with these services. The Board recommends that it be given the authority to issue construction and operating certificates of public convenience and necessity in connection with these services.

The Board recommends that providers who provide both Basic Telecommunications Services and Non-Basic Telecommunications Services be required to file a Contribution Test for the collective total of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services to ensure that Basic Telecommunications Services do not subsidize the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(e) Recommended Amendments to The AGT Act

The Board recommends that certain sections of The AGT Act be rescinded in order to provide more effective competition for the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services listed in Appendix 11.

Accordingly the Board recommends the rescission of the following sections of The AGT Act:

Section 3.1

Section 9 (1)(c)

Section 10

The Board recommends that Section 28 be expanded to provide, that disputes respecting interconnection terms and conditions be referred to the Board for adjudication.

The Board recommends that Sections 12 and 18 be revised to provide for Board approval of financing arrangements.

The Board recommends that Section 26 (1) be revised to provide for Board approval of franchise agreements.

Other amendments to The AGT Act may be required should the Board's recommendations be accepted.

9. THE RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

(f) Recommended Amendments to The PUB Act

The Board recommends that it be given clear authority in The PUB Act to regulate broadcasting receiving entities who own or operate facilities within the Province of Alberta, except as to content, as discussed in Section 9.(c) of this Report.

The Board recommends that it be given clear authority in The PUB and/or MG Acts to regulate 'et'.

Other amendments to The PUB Act may be required should the Board's recommendations be accepted.

(g) Recommended Amendments to The MG Act

The Board recommends that it be given clear authority to approve special franchise agreements between municipalities and Cable Television Companies pursuant to Section 270(2) of The MG Act.

Other amendments to The MG Act may be required should the Board's recommendation be accepted.

(h) Recommended Amendments to The MT Act

Amendments to The MT Act may be required should the Board's recommendations be accepted.

Appendix 14 provides a summary of the providers (who participated in the Inquiry), the systems and the physical plant, present and potential services, existing and recommended regulatory framework for each group of the Non-Basic Telecommunications Services which were the Subjects of the Inquiry, namely:

A.1 Carriage Services

A.2 Public or Private Television Services

A.3 Public or Private Mobile Services

A.4 Public or Private Remote Monitoring and Controlling Services

A.5 Public or Private Information Services.

This concludes the text of Report No. E80111 which together with the Appendices which follow constitutes the Board's report on the inquiry into the provision of all Local Non-Broadcasting Telecommunications Services directed by Orders in Council 1287/78 and 180/79, all of which is respectfully submitted.

PUBLIC UTILITIES BOARD

CHAIRMAN

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL

BOARD REFERENCE MATERIAL

Information Bulletin No. 1 dated June 8, 1979

Information Bulletin No. 2 dated September 7, 1979

Information Bulletin No. 3 dated December 21, 1979

Submission Guidelines dated August 1, 1979

PUBLIC HEARING REFERENCE MATERIAL

Exhibit	Title
1.	AGT Submission
2.	Information Responses, AGT
3.	AGT Non-Basic Services Tariff, Radio Services
4.	Bell Canada Customer Provided Paging Equipment Terminal Connection Standard dated July, 1979
5.	Preliminary, Bell Canada, Public Land Mobile Telephone Services Customer Provided, Dial Station Interface Specification dated January, 1978
6.	Bell Canada Customer Provided Terminal Equipment Terminal Connection Standards for Single Line Network Addressing Devices, Key Telephone Systems, PBX, dated January, 1980
7.	Bell Canada Customer Provided Terminal Equipment, Terminal Connection Attestation for Single Line Network Addressing Devices, Key Telephone Systems, PBX, dated January, 1980.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

PUBLIC HEARING REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

Exhibit	Title
8.	Bell Canada Customer Provided Terminal Equipment Interim Wiring Rules and Attestation for Customer Provided Inside Wiring dated January, 1980
9.	Document described as Alberta Government Telephones Replies to Information Request, City of Calgary 144, April 15, 1977
10.	Submission of The Canadian Cable Television Association dated January, 1980.
11.	AGT Terminal Equipment (Data)
12.	Submission of The Cable Television Association of Alberta dated January 11, 1980
13.	Information Responses, Cable Television Association of Alberta
14.	Curriculum Vitae of T. H Blanks
15.	Submission of Edmonton Journal and Calgary Herald dated January, 1980
16.	Information Responses, Edmonton Journal and Calgary Herald
17.	Submission of Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers' Association dated January 9, 1980
18.	Information Responses, Canadian Business Equipment Manufacturers Association
19.	Report - "FCC Deregulates Enhanced Telecommunications Services and Terminal Equipment (Docket 20828)

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

PUBLIC HEARING REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

Exhibit	Title
20.	Submission of the Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association
21.	Information Responses, Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association
22.	Frequency Coverage of AGT with Respect to Mobile Communication or Radio Common Carrier Activities
23.	Frequency Coverage of Radio Common Carriers (to be superimposed on Exhibit 22)
24.	Diagram entitled "RCC Message Relay System, 1949 - 1970"
25.	Submission of Motorola Electronics Sales dated January 11, 1980
26.	Information Responses, Motorola Electronics Sales
27.	Set of Illustrations by Motorola Electronics Sales
28.	Submission of TAS Communications
29.	Information Responses, TAS Communications
30.	'et' invoices to TAS Communications
31.	Submission of Southern Pacific Communications
32.	Information Responses, Southern Pacific Communications
33.	Southern Pacific Communications Maps and Schematics

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

PUBLIC HEARING REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

Exhibit	Title
34.	British Columbia Telephone Company, Customer Provided Paging Equipment, Terminal Connection Standard dated December 18, 1979
35.	Submission of CNCP Telecommunications dated January 11, 1980
36.	Information Responses, CNCP Telecommunications
37.	Letter dated January 8, 1980, from Canadian Petroleum Association to the Public Utilities Board
38.	Information Responses, Canadian Cable Television Association
39.	Document entitled, "A Brief to the Honourable L. Werry, Minister of Telephones, Government of Alberta", dated March 27, 1972.
40.	Submission of the City of Edmonton, dated January 11, 1980
41.	Information Responses/Edmonton Telephones
42.	Copies of slides - Edmonton Telephones, re: Energy Conservation System
43.	Copies of slides - Edmonton Telephones, re: Fibre Optics
44.	Federal Provincial Conference of Communications Ministers, Report of the Federal-Provincial Working Group on Competition/Industry Structure in the Telecommunications Industry

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

PUBLIC HEARING REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

Exhibit	Title
45.	Telegram from Business Intervenors Society to Public Utilities Board, dated May 1, 1980
46.	Ontario Cable Telecommunications Association Submission to the Government of Canada and the Government of Ontario entitled, "Towards Deregulation: The Transfer of Jurisdiction over Cable Television to the Provinces", dated January, 1980
47.	Telecommunications Services Study, Conducted for the Cable Television Association of Alberta, dated October 29, 1980

TRANSCRIPTS

Seventeen volumes numbering 1763 pages.

SUMMATIONS

	Title
1.	Alberta Government Telephones
2.	Cable Television Association of Alberta
3.	Edmonton Journal/Calgary Herald
4.	Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association
5.	Motorola Electronic Sales Limited

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

REFERENCE MATERIAL (Continued)

SUMMATIONS (Continued)

	Title
6.	TAS Communications
7.	SP Communications
8.	CNCP Telecommunications
9.	Canadian Cable Televission Association
10.	City of Edmonton/'edmonton telephones'
11.	Consumers' Association of Canada (Alberta)

REPLIES

	Title
1.	Alberta Government Telephones
2.	Cable Television Association of Alberta
3.	Canadian Radio Common Carriers Association
4.	Motorola Electronics Sales Limited
5.	TAS Communications
6.	SP Communications
7.	CNCP Telecommunications

MAJOR FACILITIES USED TO PROVIDE LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

A.1 ORIGINATION/TERMINATION EQUIPMENT

(a) Telephone Sets
(b) Mobile Telephone Sets
(c) Printing Terminals
(d) Video Display Terminals
(e) Video Cameras
(f) Graphic Terminals
(g) Facsimile Terminals
(h) Computer Data Terminals
(i) Other Data Terminals
(j) Mini Computer Terminals
(k) Encoder/Decoder Terminals
(l) Satellite Antenna Terminals
(m) Metering Terminals
(n) Other Interactive Terminals

A.2 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES

(a) Paired Cable and Wire
(b) Waveguides
(c) Microwave Radio
(d) Coaxial Cable
(e) Fiber Optics
(f) Satellites
(g) Multiplexors
(h) Concentrators
(i) Switching Systems

A.3 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURES

(a) Duct Systems
(b) Pole Lines
(c) Towers
(d) Buildings

LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

SUBJECTS OF INQUIRY

B.1 COMMON CARRIER CARRIAGE SERVICES

(a) Voice Private Line Signal Carriage
(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(c) Television Signal Carriage
(d) Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage
(e) Paging Signal Carriage
(f) Music Signal Carriage
(g) Other

B.2 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

(a) Cable Television Systems
(b) Community Antenna Television Systems
(c) Pay Television Systems
(d) Closed Circuit Television Systems (Other than Private Stand-Alone Closed Circuit Television Surveillance Systems)
(e) Other

B.3 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

(a) Public Mobile Telephone Systems (Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
(b) Private Mobile Telephone Systems
(c) Mobile Data Systems
(d) Mobile Paging Systems
(e) Other

B.4 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

(a) Fire Alarm Systems
(b) Police Alarm Systems
(c) Medical Alarm Systems
(d) Other Emergency Alarm Systems
(e) Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
(f) Utility Energy Load Control Systems
(g) Telemetering Systems
(h) Telephone Answering-Recording Systems
(i) Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/Controlling Services)
(j) Other

LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

SUBJECTS OF INQUIRY (Continued)

B.5 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

(a) News and Weather Systems
(b) Library Systems
(c) Buying/Selling Stock Systems
(d) Opinion Surveys, Voting and Referenda Systems
(e) Educational Systems
(f) Purchasing Consumer Goods and Services Systems
(g) On-Line Banking Systems
(h) Bill Paying Systems
(i) Credit Checking Systems
(j) Electronic Mail Systems
(k) Travel (Airline, Train, Bus) Schedule Systems
(l) Career and Employment Systems
(m) Other

LOCAL NON-BROADCASTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

EXCLUDED SUBJECTS

C.1 BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES

(a) Local Exchange Telephone Service (Including Main Telephone Set)
(b) Extended Area Service
(c) Extended Flat Rate Calling Service
(d) Message Toll Telephone Service
(e) Wide Area Telephone Service
(f) Public Mobile Network Service (Transmission/Distribution Facilities Only)
(g) Coin Telephone Service
(h) Conference Telephone Service

C.2 BASIC (COMPLEMENTARY) TELEPHONE SERVICES

(a) Basic Telephone Custom Calling Features (e.g. Call Forwarding, Call Waiting, Speed Calling)
(b) Premium Telephone Sets
(c) Extension Telephone Sets
(d) Key Telephones and Associated Equipment
(e) Private Switchboards and Associated Equipment
(f) Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Basic Telephone Service)

C.3 PRIVATE STAND-ALONE TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

(a) Computers and Peripherals-Data Centres
(b) Public Address and Sound Systems
(c) Business/Home Intercom Systems
(d) Apartment Intercom Security Systems
(e) Closed Circuit Television Surveillance Systems
(f) Other "In House" Telecommunication Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT

USED TO PROVIDE

BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES

A.1 ORIGINATION/TERMINATION EQUIPMENT

(a) Telephone Sets
(b) Coin Telephone Sets
(c) Key Telephone Sets and Associated Equipment
(d) Private Switchboards and Associated Equipment

A.2 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION/SWITCHING FACILITIES

(a) Open Wire
(b) Paired Wire and Cable
(c) Waveguides
(d) Microwave Radio
(e) Coaxial Cable
(f) Optical Fibre Cable
(g) Multiplexors
(h) Concentrators
(i) Switching Systems
(j) Public Mobile Base Stations

A.3 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURES

(a) Ducts
(b) Pole Lines
(c) Towers
(d) Buildings

PHYSICAL PLANT

USED TO PROVIDE

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

A.1 ORIGINATION/TERMINATION EQUIPMENT

(a) Telephone Sets
(b) Mobile Telephone Sets
(c) Video Cameras
(d) Graphic Terminals
(e) Satellite Antenna Terminals
(f) Metering Terminals
(g) Printing Terminals
(h) Video Display Terminals
(i) Facsimile Terminals
(j) Computer Data Terminals
(k) Other Data Terminals
(l) Mini Computer Terminals
(m) Encoder/Decoder Terminals
(n) Other Interactive Terminals

A.2 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION/SWITCHING FACILITIES

(a) Open Wire
(b) Paired Wire and Cable
(c) Waveguides
(d) Microwave Radio
(e) Coaxial Cable
(f) Optical Fibre Cable
(g) Multiplexors
(h) Concentrators
(i) Switching Systems
(j) Private Mobile Base Stations

A.3 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURES

(a) Ducts
(b) Pole Lines
(c) Towers
(d) Buildings

CABLE TELEVISION COMPANIES IN ALBERTA

	CTAA MEMBER	CCTA MEMBER
Alberta Broadcasting Corporation Ltd.	X	X
Banff Community Antenna T.V. Ltd.		X
Cable T.V. Camrose - Wetaskiwin	X	X
Cable West T.V. Limited	X	X
Cablevision Lethbridge Ltd.	X	X
Cablevision Medicine Hat Ltd..	X	X
Calgary Cable T.V. Ltd.	X	X
Capital Cable T.V. Ltd.	X	X
Community Antenna Television Ltd.	X	X
Crowsnest Cablevision Ltd.	X	X
Jasper Community Television Ltd.	X	X
Northern Cablevision Ltd.	X	
Quality Cable Television Ltd.	X	X
Rocky Mountain CATV Ltd.	X	
Taber Cable Television Ltd.	X	X

PHYSICAL PLANT

USED TO PROVIDE

BASIC CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES

A.1 ORIGINATION/TERMINATION EQUIPMENT

(a) Video Cameras
(b) Video Tape Recorders
(c) Monitors
(d) Controllers
(e) Selectors

A.2 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION FACILITIES

(a) Head end Antenna
(b) Coaxial Cable
(c) Amplifiers, Splitters, Couplers
(d) Optical Fibre Cable

A.3 TRANSMISSION/DISTRIBUTION STRUCTURES

(a) Ducts
(b) Pole Lines
(c) Towers
(d) Buildings

BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES

C.1 BASIC TELEPHONE SERVICES

(a) Local Exchange Telephone Service (Including Main Telephone Set)(1)
(b) Extended Area Service
(c) Extended Flat Rate Calling Service
(d) Message Toll Telephone Service
(e) Wide Area Telephone Service
(f) Public Mobile Network Service (Transmission/Distribution Facilities Only)
(g) Coin Telephone Service
(h) Conference Telephone Service

C.2 BASIC (COMPLEMENTARY) TELEPHONE SERVICES

(a) Basic Telephone Custom Calling Features(2) (e.g. Call Forwarding, Call Waiting, Speed Calling)
(b) Premium Telephone Sets(1)
(c) Extension Telephone Sets(1)
(d) Key Telephones and Associated Equipment(1)
(e) Private Switchboards and Associated Equipment(1)
(f) Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Basic Telephone Service)(1)

C.3 BASIC TELEPHONE NETWORK ACCESS SERVICE

(a) Total System Access
(b) Pole Attachment Rental Rate
(c) Duct Space Rental Rate
(d) Common Trenching Rate

Notes: (1) Subject to possible revised policy on customer-owned terminal equipment.

(2) When performed in the Central Office rather than by the terminal equipment on the customers' premises.

BASIC CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES

B.1 BASIC CABLE TELEVISION SERVICES

(a) Television Program Carriage

B.2 BASIC CABLE TELEVISION NETWORK ACCESS

(a) Total System Access

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

A.1 CARRIAGE SERVICES

(a) Voice Private Line Signal Carriage
(b) Radio Signal Carriage
(c) Television Signal Carriage
(d) Data (alphabetic, numeric) Signal Carriage
(e) Paging Signal Carriage
(f) Music Signal Carriage
(g) Other

A.2 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

(a) Pay Television Systems
(b) Closed Circuit Television Systems (Other than Private Stand-Alone Closed Circuit Television Surveillance Systems)
(c) Other

A.3 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

(a) Public Mobile Telephone Systems (Origination/Termination Equipment Only)
(b) Private Mobile Telephone Systems
(c) Mobile Data Systems
(d) Mobile Paging Systems
(e) Other

A.4 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

(a) Fire Alarm Systems
(b) Police Alarm Systems
(c) Medical Alarm Systems
(d) Other Emergency Alarm Systems
(e) Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
(f) Utility Energy Load Control Systems
(g) Telemetering Systems
(h) Telephone Answering-Recording Systems
(i) Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/ Controlling Services)
(j) Other

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES (Continued)

A.5 PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

(a) News and Weather Systems
(b) Library Systems
(c) Buying/Selling Stock Systems
(d) Opinion Surveys, Voting and Referenda Systems
(e) Educational Systems
(f) Purchasing Consumer Goods and Services Systems
(g) On-Line Banking Systems
(h) Bill Paying Systems
(i) Credit Checking Systems
(j) Electronic Mail Systems
(k) Travel (Airline, Train, Bus) Schedule Systems
(l) Career and Employment Systems
(m) Other

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Provider	Basic Telecommunications Services	Non-Basic Telecommunications Services
AGT	Board Regulation 1) Price (rate base, rate of return, revenue requirement, rates) 2) Systems Interconnection 3) Quality of Service 4) Safety (general supervision only) 5) System of Accounts 6) Attachments (poles, ducts, trenches) 7) Rules and Regulations Board Regulation Specifically Removed or Substantially Modified by AGT Act 1) Franchise Approval 2) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection 3) Financing Approval 4) Construction/Extension of Transmission/Distribution Network 5) Siting and Right of Way Approval	Board Regulation 1) Filing of rates for acknowledgement 2) Contribution test for total Non-Basic Telecommunications Services
'et'	Regulation by the City of Edmonton except by the Board as follows: 1) System of Accounts 2) Appeals respecting service charges not conforming to rate schedules, improperly imposed or discriminatory.	Same regulation as for Basic Telecommunications Services.

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK (Continued)

Provider	Basic Telecommunications Services	Non-Basic Telecommunications Services
Cable Companies	CRTC Regulation 1) Licensing 2) Price (rates and installation charges) 3) Quality of Service (including program content)	None offered (one application before CRTC)
CNCP	No Basic Telecommunications Services	CRTC Regulation 1) Price 2) Quality of Service
Radio Common Carriers	No Basic Telecommunications Services	No regulation
Providers of Only Origination/ Termination Equipment	No Basic Telecommunications Services	No regulation
All Providers	1) Radio Communications: Frequency/Bandwidth/ Technical Standards (DOC) 2) Safety (Department of Labour)	

Public Utilities Board, Alberta
REPORT NO.: E80111

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

A. BOARD REGULATION

Provider	Basic Telecommunications Services	Non-Basic Telecommunications Services
Telephone Companies and Cable Television Companies	1) Price (rate base, rate of return, revenue requirement, rates) 2) Franchise Approval 3) Systems Interconnection 4) Origination/Termination Equipment Interconnection 5) Quality of Service 6) Safety 7) System of Accounts 8) Rules and Regulations 9) Financing Approval 10) Construction/Extension of Transmission/Distribution Network 11) Siting and Right of Way Approval 12) Attachments	1) Construction/Extension of Transmission/ Distribution Network 2) Filing of rates for acknowledgement 3) Contribution test for total Non-Basic Telecommunications Services
Other Providers of Transmission/ Distribution Facilities	No Basic Telecommunications Services	1) Construction/Extension of Transmission/ Distribution Network 2) Filing of rates for acknowledgement
Providers of only Origination/ Termination Equipment	No Basic Telecommunications Services	No Regulation Required

B. REGULATION BY OTHERS

1) Radio Communications: Frequency/Bandwidth/ Technical Standards (DOC)
2) Safety (Department of Labor)
3) Program Content (CRTC or other appropriate authority)

Public Utilities Board, Alberta
REPORT NO.: E80111

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INQUIRY

APPENDIX 14
INDEX

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

PROVIDERS, PLANT, EXISTING AND RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

	Page
CARRIAGE SERVICES	
AGT	1
'et'	2
Cable Television Companies	3
CNCP	4
SP	5
PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES	
AGT	6
'et'	7
Cable Television Companies	8
PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES	
AGT	9
'et'	10
CRCCA, TAS, MOTOROLA	11
PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES	
AGT	12
'et'	13
Cable Television Companies	14
CNCP	15
CRCCA, TAS, MOTOROLA	16
PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES	
AGT	17
'et'	18
Cable Television Companies	19
CNCP	20
EJCH	21

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

CARRIAGE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

AGT

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Voice Private Line Carriage
Radio Signal Carriage
Television Signal Carriage
Data Signal Carriage
Paging Signal Carriage
Music Signal Carriage

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Other Signal Carriage

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Rates Filed for Acknowledgement
Included in Contribution Test

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

CARRIAGE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

'et'

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Voice Private Line Carriage
Radio Signal Carriage
Data Signal Carriage
Paging Signal Carriage
Music Signal Carriage

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Television Signal Carriage
Other Signal Carriage

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Edmonton City Council

Type of Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

CARRIAGE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

Cable Television Companies

SYSTEM:

The Cable Television Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 8

PRESENT SERVICES:

Radio Signal Carriage
Television Signal Carriage

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Music Signal Carriage
Data Signal Carriage
Other Signal Carriage

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of
Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

CARRIAGE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

CNCP

SYSTEM:

The CNCP Telecommunications System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Voice Private Line Carriage
Radio Signal Carriage
Television Signal Carriage
Data Signal Carriage

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Paging Signal Carriage
Music Signal Carriage
Other Signal Carriage

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of
Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

CARRIAGE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

SP

SYSTEM:

The Telephone Systems
The CNCP Telecommunications System
Future SP System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Voice Private Line Carriage
Radio Signal Carriage
Television Signal Carriage
Data Signal Carriage
Paging Signal Carriage
Music Signal Carriage
Other Signal Carriage

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Not applicable

Type of
Regulation: Not applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

AGT

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Closed Circuit Television Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Pay Television Systems
Other Television Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Rates Filed for Acknowledgement
Included in Contribution Test

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

'et'

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Pay Television Systems
Closed Circuit Television Systems
Other Television Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Edmonton City Council

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE TELEVISION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

Cable Television Companies

SYSTEM:

The Cable Television Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 8

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Pay Television Systems
Closed Circuit Television Systems
Other Television Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

AGT

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Public Mobile Telephone Systems
(Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
Private Mobile Telephone Systems
Mobile Paging Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Mobile Data Systems
Other Mobile Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Rates Filed for Acknowledgement
Included in Contribution Test

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

'et'

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Private Mobile Telephone Systems
Mobile Paging Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Public Mobile Telephone Systems
(Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
Mobile Data Systems
Other Mobile Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Edmonton City Council

Type of
Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE MOBILE SERVICES

PROVIDER:

CRCCA, TAS, MOTOROLA

SYSTEM:

The Radio Common Carrier Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Public Mobile Telephone Systems
(Origination/Termination Facilities Only)
Private Mobile Telephone Systems
Mobile Paging Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Mobile Data Systems
Other Mobile Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: None

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

PROVIDER:

AGT

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Telemetering Systems
Telephone Answering-Recording Systems
Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/ Controlling Services)

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Fire Alarm Systems
Police Alarm Systems
Medical Alarm Systems
Other Emergency Alarm Systems
Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
Utility Energy Load Control Systems
Other Remote Monitoring and Controlling Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board
Type of
Regulation: Rates Filed for Acknowledgement
Included in Contribution Test

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board
Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

PROVIDER:

'et'

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Telemetering Systems
Telephone Answering - Recording Systems
Automatic Dialing Equipment (Associated with Monitoring/ Controlling Services)

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

File Alarm Systems
Police Alarm Systems
Medical Alarm Systems
Other Emergency Alarm Systems
Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
Utility Energy Load Control Systems
Other Remote Monitoring and Controlling Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Edmonton City Council

Type of Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

PROVIDER:

Cable Television Companies

SYSTEM:

The Cable Television System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 8

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Fire Alarm Systems
Police Alarm Systems
Medical Alarm Systems
Other Emergency Alarm Systems
Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
Utility Energy Load Control Systems
Telemetering Systems
Other Remote Monitoring and Controlling Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

PROVIDER:

CNCP

SYSTEM:

The CNCP Telecommunications System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Other Emergency Alarm Systems
Telemetering Systems

EXISTING REGULATOR FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE REMOTE MONITORING AND CONTROLLING SERVICES

PROVIDER:

CRCCA, TAS, MOTOROLA

SYSTEM:

The Radio Common Carrier Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

Fire Alarm Systems
Police Alarm Systems
Medical Alarm Systems
Other Emergency Alarm Systems
Telemetering Systems
Telephone Answering-Recording Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Automatic Utility Meter Reading Systems
Utility Energy Load Control Systems
Other Remote Monitoring and Controlling Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Not Applicable

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

AGT

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Telephone Directory Systems
Telecommunications Facilities for Information Producers and Packagers
Other Public or Private Information Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates
(Transmission/Distribution Facilities
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

'et'

SYSTEM:

Telephone System

PHYSICAL PLANT

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Telephone Directory Systems
Telecommunications Facilities for Information Producers and Packagers
Other Public or Private Information Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Edmonton City Council

Type of Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

Cable Television Companies

SYSTEM:

The Cable Television Systems

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 8

PRESENT SERVICES:

News and Weather Systems

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Telecommunications Facilities for Information Producers and Packagers
Other Public or Private Information Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of Regulation: Rates Filed for Approval

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement
Include in Contribution Test

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

CNCP

SYSTEM:

The CNCP Telecommunications System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

Telecommunications Facilities for Information Producers and Packagers
Other Public or Private Information Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: CRTC

Type of Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of Regulation: Construction/Operating Certificates (Transmission/Distribution Facilities)
File Rates for Acknowledgement

NON-BASIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS

PUBLIC OR PRIVATE INFORMATION SERVICES

PROVIDER:

EJCH

SYSTEM:

The Telephone Systems
Cable Television Systems
The CNCP Telecommunications System

PHYSICAL PLANT:

Appendix 6 and Appendix 8

PRESENT SERVICES:

None

POTENTIAL SERVICES:

News Systems
Other Public or Private Information Systems

EXISTING REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Not Applicable

Type of
Regulation: Not Applicable

RECOMMENDED REGULATORY FRAMEWORK:

Regulator: Board

Type of
Regulation: File Rates for Acknowledgement